THE LIBERATOR.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,
AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 25, CORNHILL,
BY
HENRY W. WILLIAMS, GENERAL AGENT.

☞ All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be directed, (postpaid,) to the General Agent.

☞ TERMS—$2 50 per annum, payable in advance; or $3 00 at the expiration of six months.

☞ Five copies will be sent to one address for ten dollars, if payment be forwarded in advance.

☞ ADVERTISEMENTS making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cts.; one square for $1 00.

Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELLIS GRAY LORING, EDMUND QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILLIPS, WENDELL PHILLIPS. [This committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper.]

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

THE LIBERATOR.

LETTERS FROM HENRY C. WRIGHT.

Sunday morning, July 7, 1844.

Steamer Sclavonia. On the Danube.

It is 4 o'clock. I am now on the deck of the steamer, one hundred miles above Vienna. It is hardly possible to give an idea of the manner in which over fifty men, women and children were stowed away in the cabin last night. No berths, no sheets, no blankets, no mattresses, no benches, no cushions, no sofas; no more means for lying down to sleep, than if we had been so many wild beasts. And this is a night boat, and always expects to be out one night on her trips between Vienna and Linz. We remained on deck till after 10 o'clock, last evening, discussing non-resistance, anti-slavery, and the government of Austria, and enjoying the wild scenery through which we were passing. I went down to find a place to couch down upon in the cabin, having loaned my blanket to my companion to roll himself up to sleep on deck. Such a scene as I found in the cabin! Some lying on chairs, some on the floor, some leaning upon the table, and some leaning their heads upon the shoulders of friends, all seeking sleep. I arranged some chairs, and laid down upon them, and was soon asleep; but my companion, whose wife slept, my feet and shoulders rolled off, and left my heels some two feet higher than my head. In this position I was awakened, and found my head ready to split. I found the windows all closed, and the room close and suffocating. Forty persons were crowded into a close, small cabin, to sleep, and there they lay, scattered about. My next neighbor was a son of Metternich, the first prince of the empire. Rank, and station, and title are levelled by sleep, as well as by death; and I only wish the levelling were as permanent in the one case as in the other. I arose, and came on deck, and walked up and down, taking air-bath—no cap on my head, no neck-cloth, collar and bosom open; and the pure morning air felt delicious. I found my companion lying on the left of the helsman, and the Prince of Swartzenberg on his right; both covered with soot, which during the night shivered upon them from the top of the chimney. They looked frightful.

5 o'clock.

Now passing the castle of Aggstein, perched upon a high rock, one of the most picturesque feudal ruins on the Danube—a robber's nest of ancient notoriety, it living back into the 11th century. One is now relating some traditions about it—that it belonged to a knightly marauder, who preyed upon the surrounding inhabitants, and upon the boats and merchandize upon the river, and who used to precipitate his prisoners through a hole down into an abyss below, ironically and profanely called by him '*the bed of roses.*' This robber and his companions piled the trade of robbery as successfully as do Polk, Clay and Tyler; and they were called '*the hounds.*' How significantly might slaveholders be thus termed! These feudal robbers had ten strong holds on the Danube, which they called their '*ten fingers.*' Aggstein is said to have been the place where Richard of England was, for a short time, confined, before he was ransomed in Durrenstein. There are many ruins of these old feudal castles on the banks of the Danube, in this region; and their ancient owners, who lived by plunder and murder, were, in their day, regarded as devout, Christian knights, and gentlemen of gallant bearing and chivalrous renown. They had chaplains in their dens of robbery and blood, to read to them the Bible, to pray with and for them, and to give thanks to God after a successful foraging expedition. I am reminded of a remark by the Rev. Dr. Trumbull of Connecticut, who, speaking of the expedition against fort Mystick, in which about *six hundred* Indian women and children were killed, says that 'devout and animated prises were made to God throughout the colonies.' So did the bishops and clergy of England offer 'animated prises to God,' because they had killed *twenty thousand* Chinese, and obtained from the surviving friends of those whom they had murdered, several millions of money. So were those old robbers very 'animated in their thanksgiving.' Their religion, as well as the religion of man-killing England and man-stealing America, sanctioned every possible crime. A devout robber! A praying slaveholder! A pious Christian soldier, who lives by butchering men, women and children, without regard to their guilt or innocence! Hadmer, '*the hound*' of Aggstein, was as pious, devout, and praying a Christian, as were Nelson, Washington, or Jefferson; or as are Wellington, Tyler, Clay, or Polk. In the light of Christianity, they were and are all as truly devoted, robbers and murderers, as are housebreakers, highway robbers, and midnight assassins.

7 o'clock, A. M.

For the first time, I have a glimpse of the Alps, at the south-west. Several snow-covered peaks are in view, shooting up in the clouds. Swartzenberg, who has often been among them hunting, is now pointing them out. We have now been on the river over twenty hours, and have not yet come in sight of Linz. Slow work and wearisome, but I have been able to keep up a constant excitement and discussion on board, about slavery and war. Many military men, of high standing, are with us; and one advocate of American slavery, and he calls himself an American, from New-Orleans. Fierce, and loud, and bluster, he is in defence of whips, chains and fetters; and also of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bible—all of which, he says, sanction slavery. He declares that Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Washington and Jefferson were good slaveholders; and that God instituted slavery!

10 o'clock.

Now within eight miles of Linz. A mountainous country. On the tops of the mountains all around are castles and churches. The river has the same white, muddy appearance, which it is said to have down to its mouth. Off to the south tower up the Alps, which look wild, and deep-interesting. This is *Sunday*; but almost all are busy on board at *knitting*. As for the men, we have had a meeting on deck to discuss the question of forming a compact with *slaveholders* to guard and spread the principles of liberty, and with *man-thieves* to spread Christianity, and to teach a world not to steal.

11 o'clock.

In front of Linz. Cannon are fired to hail our coming. The quay is lined with men and women, in their Sunday dress, clean and neat. We were all absorbed in discussing the dissolution of the American Union. I had just quoted the following, as applicable to the ministers, churches, and politicians of the non-slaveholding States: 'When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers; thou speakest against thy brother, and slanderest thine own mother's son. These things hast thou done, saith God. Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself; but I will reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes. Now consider this, ye that forget God, least I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver.' Rath, the tutor of Metternich's family, Swartzenberg and others, were very particular in their inquiries about the chances of a dissolution of the Union, and the effect of such an event on slavery, and the cause of liberty, as I understood liberty. I showed them how slavery was sustained by the Constitution, and how the whole power of the nation was pledged to keep the slaves from running away, and from gaining liberty by arms, and to enforce them in their present condition as chattels, till it should please their oppressors to let them go free. We were so intensely absorbed in our discussion, and the advocate of slavery was so furious in his wrath against me for what he called 'treason and treachery' against my country, that we did not separate till sometime after the boat had come up to the wharf or quay. Before we parted, I said to my Austrian friends, 'Do not look to America as a practical illustration of the principles of Democracy. I am a Democrat, but I have no more sympathy with American Democracy, than Austrian despotism. By Democracy, I mean, *individual self-government under God.* And if the means now extended to support the thrones and sceptres of blood were expended to enable the people how to govern, each one him and herself, by the eternal laws of truth and right, the world would be much better governed. I care not how soon the slaveholding Republic of America is blotted from the records of time, but the great principles, that every human being is born free, and cannot be subjected to the dominion of man without wrong, will never die. They will spread and hurl every despot from his bloody throne, and annihilate every human institution that must exist by enslaving or killing men.' We parted to meet no more.

2 o'clock, P. M.

Goldenen Adlen, (or Golden Eagle,) Linz.—Before a passenger could land, we all had to give up our passports to armed police-men, who came on board. They gave us a receipt, to be returned when we called for our passports. I came to this hotel, standing on the banks of the Danube. My first step was to take a bath in cold water for half an hour—a most refreshing operation. As I entered the hotel, and selected my room, and deposited my baggage in it, the landlord presented a paper, in which I must write my name, age, residence, calling, where from, where to, &c. This paper, he said, was for the use of the police; and that he was bound, by law, to find out these things about every guest who came to his house, for a shorter or longer time, and give information to the police.

7 o'clock.

On Castle hill—just outside the town—stretched on the grass, looking down upon the Danube, flowing rapidly at my feet. This hill overlooks the whole region. The sun is sinking behind the distant mountains in unobstructed splendor. The West is kindled with light and glory—there is a church with two steeples on the mountain, behind which the sun is sitting—an old den of heathenism, folly and superstition.—There are 32 forts on the hills and eminences around Linz; and churches without number; the former to protect the rich from the poor, and the latter, to the souls of men. I have spent five hours walking about the town and the promenades in the suburbs. The people of the town are all out, strolling in the beautiful walks and public gardens. Several bands of music are stationed in different places, to play for the amusement of the people. A large band is now playing in a public garden near me, and the whole atmosphere seems full of sweet sounds and sweet fragrance. It seems to be the usual custom of the people of Austria to go to church in the forenoon of Sunday, to witness the performances of the priests; and to devote the afternoons and evenings of that day to amusements—to social intercourse—to music and dancing. Many companies of soldiers are marching about the streets, at the sound of martial music. It is amusing to watch the customs and manners of the people. The market is full at this hour, though it is Sunday; all are in their Sunday dress, and have on their Sunday faces—but, unlike the Sunday faces of Boston, they are all beaming with joy and smiles. These men, women, and children, of Linz, seem to think that Sunday is the day to smile and look happy. They have not yet learned that it is wrong to walk in the open air, to smile, and be happy on Sunday. One thing is perfectly clear to my mind,—that they get more physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual good in their market, and their public walks and gardens, interchanging their thoughts and feelings freely, than they would to spend the day in their gloomy old churches, witnessing the solemn, inhuman, heathenish performances of their spiritual guides.

July 8th. Monday morning, 4 o'clock.

I am standing on the middle of the bridge that crosses the river opposite the town. I am looking down at the deep, muddy, swift waters beneath. The river is about one tenth of a mile wide. The scenery around is picturesque, the morning clear and cool. I stand here, nearly 5000 miles from home, writing; the Danube flowing under my feet. It is pleasant to stand here, and feel and think and write. My thoughts are on the past. All up and down the river, on both banks, are remains of deeds of robbery and murder, committed by those who had named the name of Christ. The people from the surrounding country are hurrying past me with fruit, vegetables and meat, to market. They stare at me, and I stare at them. They think I look odd, and I am sure they do. The headdress of the women, as they hurry to market, is most ludicrous to me. But it is their way, and I do not bother myself about it. *Dress for human beings—not human beings for dress.* The cap for the head, not the head for the cap—the coat for the body, and not the body for the coat. But I will follow them to the market square, and see them buy and sell.

5 o'clock.

Market square. Such a clatter of tongues—such a variety of costume—such *what-will-you-buy* faces—such fussing and fuming, in laying out and displaying fruits; such heaps upon heaps of beautiful cherries, so cheap that one is almost ashamed to buy them; such laughing and good nature; it is very pleasant to be in these markets. The market, of all places, if one wishes to study the temper and character of the people.

Now looking at a large triangular monument in Market square. A column called '*Trinity Column*,' placed between the figures of Jupiter and Neptune, commemorates the escape of Linz from two evils, i. e., the *plague*, and the *Turks*, in 1723. On one side of the column is an inscription to God the Father; on another, one to Mary and the Son; on another, one to the Holy Ghost. These stone monuments to God are in many towns and cities; and they are as acceptable to Him as the towers on churches. The people are pouring into the market from every quarter. There is no market house. The articles for sale are spread out on the side-walks, around the Trinity Column, and the middle of the streets. Most all the marketing is done by the women. They bring all the fruits and vegetables into market on their body; the men, not unfrequently, walking by their sides with nothing in their hands, but solemnly and devoutly sucking their foul tobacco pipes.

☞ The following letter should have been appended to the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in our last number, but was omitted for want of room. We think there is some little confusion in the mind of our worthy friend Powell, with regard to the disunion question. Surely, as a colored man, he cannot wish for freemen to continue in union with slaveholders.

POSITION OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

NEW-YORK, Jan. 21, 1845.

DEAR BRETHREN:

Circumstances beyond my control constrain me to forego the pleasure of meeting with you at the thirteenth annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. Though one of the least of those engaged in the glorious struggle for the perpetuity of the principles of this organization, American slavery, I feel a deep interest in your deliberations. And every feasible plan emanating from your body for the immediate and unconditional emancipation of the enslaved—for the total abrogation of all the disabilities under which our people (the nominally free) labor—stripped of sects, creeds, or party predilections—shall have my unequivocal support.

Brethren, remember you occupy an important station in the eyes of the world. Your deeds pledged your lives, your sacred honor, on the altar of freedom. Your have proclaimed it on the housetops, that man cannot hold property in man. You now have a solemn and an important duty to perform—great principles to settle, but no peculiar views to establish.

The great question of human slavery must be decided now!—not prospectively, not gradually, but immediately. Shall this iniquitious system of enormities, towering up to the heavens, like your granite shaft on Bunker Hill, filling the land with the groans and cries of suffering millions of our countrymen, cease to exist—cease to pollute this soil—cease to make merchandize of God's image? Or shall it be handed down to our posterity forever?

Painful as it is to me, yet I feel it no less my duty to call upon you to ponder well before you adopt any new experiment, any new test, by which to regulate the right of opinion, or the right of speech. Is not the anti-slavery platform broad enough to contain, without fear, the free of sect, creed, or party? If no union with slaveholders' means that abolitionists, as such, shall withdraw from pro-slavery parties—refrain from voting under a pro-slavery constitution—or refuse to do military service, or to hold any national or state office, directly or indirectly, under this slaveholding government, (which, by the way, they have a perfect right to do)—then I must confess my inability to buckle on this new anti-slavery armor—it is too cumbersome.

To withdraw from a pro-slavery church and pro-slavery parties, I have no objection. I go further. To stand aloof from the would-be Liberty party, and give it no countenance, is an inherent principle in my anti-slavery manual. But to avowedly declare that I owe no allegiance to the government I live under, whatever protection I may claim—under any circumstances, right or wrong, is to my mind perfectly inconsistent, and contrary to the genius and spirit of this governmental polity, as such, which declares that the power of redressing public grievances is vested in the people, the sovereign people. Yet, whenever this mighty lever can be applied to the rotten system of American slavery,—operated upon by anti-slavery truth, fresh from the artillery of heaven,—it certainly must fall; for our cause is just and must and will prevail.

But how, I ask, are we to abolish slavery by a return to new weapons of defence? In reply, our friends say that 'no union with slaveholders' will abolish the evil. Suppose, then, we dissolve the Union—will it abolish slavery? A case in point. The great body of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1844, dissolved the union between themselves, and now have a southern and northern Conference. Have they abolished slavery in the Methodist connexion? Is not slavery in the church as rampant as ever?

Further—no man in his senses will advocate the rightfulness of legalized murder. For myself, I might never can be suppl

ADDRESS

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE U. STATES,

ADOPTED IN FANEUIL HALL, JAN. 30, 1845.

By the Great Anti-Texas Convention held in the name and by the authority of the People of Massachusetts, without distinction of party.

It is a fundamental maxim of all our American Constitutions, that the people are the only rightful source of political power; that government is a delegated and limited trust; that all authority not conferred is reserved; and that, in fact, there are grave questions, lying deeper than the organized forms of government, of which each government, in each of its branches, has just cause to plead, themselves, the limits imposed on their own authority, subject to such checks and balances as the framers of government may have provided. But in times of great excitement, political and moral, and at such times when men's passions strengthen dangerously, the natural tendency of all power to enlarge its limits by consolidation, overbears, with its specious arguments and bad precedents, in such times it behooves the great constituent body to put forth its own power to restore the balance of parties, and to judge for itself, whether its agents are about to transcend their authority and abuse their trust.

Such an inquiry, in the judgment of this Convention, is imperatively demanded of the United States, by the project broached last year, and now zealously and boldly pursued, of annexing Texas to the United States.

This question transcends all the bounds of ordinary political topics. It is not a question how the United States shall be represented in Congress, but whether constitute the United States: it is not a question as to what system of policy shall prevail in the country, but what the country itself shall be. It is a question which concerns the life of the republic. The inquiry is, whether we shall remain as we have been since 1789, or whether we shall now join another nation, and, in fact, not only our interests, hopes and prospects, but our very being, with another, and a foreign State.

This, fellow-citizens, is a question which, we are glad to know does awaken a deep and intense feeling throughout a great part of the country, touches reflecting minds to the very quick, because it appears to threaten a strike at fundamental, no, danger first principles, and to menace, in a manner well calculated to excite alarm and terror, the stability of our political institutions.

A question of this magnitude is too broad to stand on any platform of party politics; it is too deep for any, or all, of the political creeds of the age of the day; it presents itself, or should present itself, not to political organizations, not to existing parties, not to political interests or local considerations, but to the People of the United States, the WHOLE PEOPLE of the United States, as a subject of the greatest and most lasting importance, and calling, if necessary, for extraordinary, for immediate consideration and resolute action.

We are assembled here, where the voice of freemen is wont to be uttered, to signify our opposition to this project. We are assembled here, as we hold as it is alarming, scarcely seeking to dissipate the want of constitutional power to sustain it, and seeking forth its great and leading objects, with no abashing a countenance, and such hardihood of avowal, as to create astonishment, not only in the United States, but all over the world. We, in this protest against it, in the most solemn manner, we shall state the great grounds of our protest, respectfully and dispassionately, but freely and fearlessly, and as it ought to be, as we hold, the most profound conviction that we are resisting a measure, the mischief of which cannot be measured in its magnitude, nor calculated in its duration.

We regard the scheme of annexing Texas to the United States, as involving

1. A plain violation of the Constitution.

2. As calculated and designed, by the open declaration of its friends, to uphold the interests of slavery, cannot be influence, and secure its permanent duration.

I. There is no constitutional power in any branch of the Government, or all the branches of the Government, to annex a foreign State to the Union.

The successful termination of the Revolutionary war left the old thirteen States free and independent, distinct and, in a political sense, sovereign. Some of these States possessed large tracts of territory, lying within the limits of their respective charters, and claimed by them as their own, and cultivated or settled. Before the adoption of the present Constitution, it is well known these States made cessions, granted and conveyed to the United States, with the main original purpose of disposing of the same for the payment of the debt of the Revolution.

The cession of Virginia, to whom much the largest portion of this territory belonged, being all the land within her original charter, was made in 1784; and it was upon the consideration of that grant that the ceded territory should be laid out and formed into States, each to be of suitable extent, not more than a hundred, nor more than a hundred and fifty miles square.

At the adoption of the present Constitution, these territories belonged to the United States, and the government of the United States was bound to make provision for their admission into the Union, as States, as soon as they should become properly settled and cultivated. Accordingly, the first Government of this territory, the memorable ordinance of July, 1787, was passed, and constituted the public law of the country, until the present Constitution was adopted. It became, then, the duty and duty of the framers of that instrument, to make provision suitable to the subject. The Constitution declares, that Congress shall have, in fact, the power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory of the United States." This gave the authority of governing the territory, as territory, while it remained such. And in the same article it is provided as follows:

Art. 4. Sec. 3. 'New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or created within the jurisdiction of any other State, nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislature of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress.'

It is quite impossible to read this clear and exact provision, without seeing that Congress had in view two forms in which the States should be admitted and admitted into the Union. 1st. They might be created out of the territory which the United States then held, and in regard to which the original stipulation was, that it should be formed into States in due time, and those States admitted into the Union. 2d, New States might be formed by the division of old States, or parts of States; but in this case, the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned was made necessary, as well as that of Congress.

It is plain and manifest, that in all this there is not the slightest view towards any future acquisition of territory.

The Constitution was made for the country, as it then existed—that country then embracing both States and Territories; and it would be a perfectly hopeless task to seek to find, in the whole instrument, any manifest avowal, or any lurking intention to bring any thing into this Union, not already belonging to it, either as a State or a Territory. The Constitution was no more meant to embrace Texas, than to embrace Cuba, or Jamaica, or Ireland. And it would well become those who attempt, by making such efforts to torture the Constitution, till it shall seem to confer authority never intended by it, to acquaint themselves somewhat better with the political history of the period of its adoption.

The old Convention took effect in July, 1778, the third year of our independence. During the war, the thirteen States had manifested a desire that their cause should be strengthened by the junction of Canada. There was, as all know, a very able and powerful address from the old Congress to the inhabitants of that province, and the door was still kept open for Canada to come into the Union. By the eleventh article of the Confederation it was expressly stipulated, that 'Canada, acceding to this confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to, all the advantages of this Union.' Then follow the words 'But no other colony shall be admitted into the same, unless such admission be agreed to by nine States.' Nine out of thirteen, then, being two-thirds of all the original States, were required to assent, before a new State could be brought in. Thus stood the great principle of our Union, when the present Constitution was framed in 1787. At that time, but subsequent to the date of the articles of confederation, the United States, as we have seen, had acquired the vast territory northward of the Ohio, and stipulated that it should be formed into States.

The old provision of the eleventh article of the confederation was omitted in the new Constitution, and provision made applicable, and only applicable, to States already in the Union, and territories already possessed by the United States.

We see, then, that under the confederation, new States might come in by the consent of two-thirds, and not otherwise. We see, by the present Constitution, provision is made for the admission of new States, formed out of the existing territory, or out of other existing States, and not otherwise. It is not most manifest, that it the framers of the Constitution had looked to the admission of new States, to be formed out of foreign territory, it would be required, it would, at least, have guarded such a purpose, and such a power, by such a limitation, at least, as should be equivalent to that on the same subject, contained in the confederation?

The advocates of the annexation of Texas are driven to the necessity of contending, that new States may be admitted, formed of territory not the original limits of the United States, although the Constitution has carefully and sedulously omitted and rejected the clause which, in the confederation, and has made a provision of its own, the end and design of which cannot be misunderstood or disregarded, without violence to plain rules and clear language, as well as ignorance of, or contempt for, all the contemporaneous history of the country.

They are obliged to contend, also, that this constitutional authority, raised by feeble and forced construction, by unfounded inference and remote analogy, extends not only to the admission of territories or colonies of other independent nations, but to these individual nations themselves; in other words, that a government formed for protection and benefit of the people of the United States, each one of which States is enumerated and set down in the Constitution of the United States, may not only add to the number of these States, but may also bring in a foreign power, with all its own peculiar interests, connexions, debts and liabilities, and, not only this, but may, with, not only our interests, hopes and prospects, but our very being, with another, and a foreign State.

This, fellow-citizens, is a question, we are glad to know does awaken, a deep and intense feeling throughout a great part of the country, touches reflecting minds to the very quick, because it appears to threaten a strike at fundamental, no, danger first principles, and to menace, in a manner well calculated to excite alarm and terror, the stability of our political institutions.

A question of this magnitude is too broad to stand on any platform of party politics; it is too deep for any, or all, of the political creeds of the age of the day; it presents itself, or should present itself, not to political organizations, not to existing parties, not to political interests or local considerations, but to the People of the United States, the WHOLE PEOPLE of the United States, as a subject of the greatest and most lasting importance, and calling, if necessary, for extraordinary, for immediate consideration and resolute action.

We are assembled here, where the voice of freemen is wont to be uttered, to signify our opposition to this project. We are assembled here, as we hold as it is alarming, scarcely seeking to dissipate the want of constitutional power to sustain it, and seeking forth its great and leading objects, with no abashing a countenance, and such hardihood of avowal, as to create astonishment, not only in the United States, but all over the world. We, in this protest against it, in the most solemn manner, we shall state the great grounds of our protest, respectfully and dispassionately, but freely and fearlessly, and as it ought to be, as we hold, the most profound conviction that we are resisting a measure, the mischief of which cannot be measured in its magnitude, nor calculated in its duration.

We regard the scheme of annexing Texas to the United States, as involving

1. A plain violation of the Constitution.

2. As calculated and designed, by the open declaration of its friends, to uphold the interests of slavery, cannot be influence, and secure its permanent duration.

I. There is no constitutional power in any branch of the Government, or all the branches of the Government, to annex a foreign State to the Union.

The successful termination of the Revolutionary war left the old thirteen States free and independent, distinct and, in a political sense, sovereign. Some of these States possessed large tracts of territory, lying within the limits of their respective charters, and claimed by them as their own, and cultivated or settled. Before the adoption of the present Constitution, it is well known these States made cessions, granted and conveyed to the United States, with the main original purpose of disposing of the same for the payment of the debt of the Revolution.

The cession of Virginia, to whom much the largest portion of this territory belonged, being all the land within her original charter, was made in 1784; and it was upon the consideration of that grant that the ceded territory should be laid out and formed into States, each to be of suitable extent, not more than a hundred, nor more than a hundred and fifty miles square.

At the adoption of the present Constitution, these territories belonged to the United States, and the government of the United States was bound to make provision for their admission into the Union, as States, as soon as they should become properly settled and cultivated. Accordingly, the first Government of this territory, the memorable ordinance of July, 1787, was passed, and constituted the public law of the country, until the present Constitution was adopted. It became, then, the duty and duty of the framers of that instrument, to make provision suitable to the subject. The Constitution declares, that Congress shall have, in fact, the power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory of the United States." This gave the authority of governing the territory, as territory, while it remained such. And in the same article it is provided as follows:

Art. 4. Sec. 3. 'New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or created within the jurisdiction of any other State, nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislature of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress.'

It is quite impossible to read this clear and exact provision, without seeing that Congress had in view two forms in which the States should be admitted and admitted into the Union. 1st. They might be created out of the territory which the United States then held, and in regard to which the original stipulation was, that it should be formed into States in due time, and those States admitted into the Union. 2d, New States might be formed by the division of old States, or parts of States; but in this case, the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned was made necessary, as well as that of Congress.

It is plain and manifest, that in all this there is not the slightest view towards any future acquisition of territory.

The Constitution was made for the country, as it then existed—that country then embracing both States and Territories; and it would be a perfectly hopeless task to seek to find, in the whole instrument, any manifest avowal, or any lurking intention to bring any thing into this Union, not already belonging to it, either as a State or a Territory. The Constitution was no more meant to embrace Texas, than to embrace Cuba, or Jamaica, or Ireland. And it would well become those who attempt, by making such efforts to torture the Constitution, till it shall seem to confer authority never intended by it, to acquaint themselves somewhat better with the political history of the period of its adoption.

The old Convention took effect in July, 1778, the third year of our independence. During the war, the thirteen States had manifested a desire that their cause should be strengthened by the junction of Canada. There was, as all know, a very able and powerful address from the old Congress to the inhabitants of that province, and the door was still kept open for Canada to come into the Union. By the eleventh article of the confederation it was expressly stipulated, that 'Canada, acceding to this confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to, all the advantages of this Union.' Then follow the words 'But no other colony shall be admitted into the same, unless such admission be agreed to by nine States.' Nine out of thirteen, then, being two-thirds of all the original States, Whoever seeks, therefore, to confer the power of ratifying treaties upon the Senate, by the framers of the United States, acting under its constitutional limitations as to numbers, appears to be striking a deadly blow at one of the most considerate provisions, which regard the States as States, and give them, as States, an equal share in the administration of the government.

But we doubt not, it is unfounded. According to our convictions, there is no power in any branch of the government, or in all its branches, to annex foreign territory to this Union. We have made the foregoing remarks, not only to show that if any fair construction could show such a power to be conferred by implication, or to be exercised, in any form, yet the manner of its exercise has been properly destitute of all decent semblance of constitutional propriety.

Great reliance is placed by the advocates of annexation on the precedents of Louisiana and Florida. It is not to be denied that those precedents do, very unfortunately, embarrass the discussion, because precedents are often allowed to have influence, without full consideration of all the circumstances which may make them rather exceptions to a general rule, than establishments of rules.

Louisiana was acquired under very peculiar circumstances, totally distinct from those which permit or require the admission of Texas, or any other case; circumstances affecting, and liable to affect as well the peace of the country, as the useful employment of its commerce and industry. Every one saw the importance of the control of the mouth of the Mississippi; every one saw that while a foreign government held Louisiana, we commanded no outlet for the sea through the great rivers of the West. With Spain we had had difficulties, menacing war. It was obvious that our western region, with its vast resources, was, in fact, in a state, comparising citizens, whose necessities for a passage to the ocean were increasing with their population, and then, the most imminent peril was, after refusing from insisting, at whatever hazard, on the free use of the greatest river in the world, along whose banks and among whose tributaries it was situated, from its sources to the mouth.

The acquisition of Louisiana was a measure of Mr. Jefferson's administration. He himself appears to have felt some doubts, whether it could ever be admitted into the Union, without an alteration of the Constitution. Such an alteration was certainly contemplated, and even recommended by him: but the posture of things at the moment, and the general acquiescence of the country in the attainment of what it had seemed so necessary to attain, led to the ratification of the treaty, and the subsequent admission of Louisiana into the Union as a State, without any alteration of the Constitution. The precedent, however, of the objects of the acquisition were similar to those which had prevailed in regard to Louisiana, with this further statement: that the whole value of the territory should be paid to those, the French Nobles, who had just claims against the Spanish government for seizures and spoliations of property.

'It would be a most unfortunate precedent,' said PATRICK HENRY in the Virginia Convention, 'that every one of my fellow-beings were emancipated. As we unjustly deprive them of their liberty, it is fitting on which has numbered us among the free, we ought to lament and deplore the necessity of holding our fellow-men in bondage.' 'I believe a time will come,' he also said in a letter to a friend in his own State, 'when an opportunity will be offered to abolish this lamentable evil.'

'Till Congress possess the power, I assure,' [the abolition of slavery,] said JOHN JAY, writing from Spain in 1780, 'her prayers to Heaven will be impious. I hope, therefore, that it will come, if I believe it to be a maxim in his, as in our courts, that those who ask for equity ought to do it.'

We cannot ourselves wish quoting further a premise of the Abolition Act of Pennsylvania.

'When we contemplate our abhorrence of that condition to which the arms and tyranny of Great Britain were preparing to reduce us, and look back on the variety of dangers to which we have been exposed, and how miraculously, in many instances, our deliverance has been wrought, the interferances wrought, when even hope and human fortitude have become unequal to the conflict; we are unavoidably led to a serious and grateful sense of the manifold blessings which we have mercifully received from the hand of that Being, from whom every good and perfect gift cometh. Impressed with these ideas, we conceive that by the early and we rejoice that it is in our power, to extend a portion of that freedom to others which has been extended to us, and release them from the state of thraldom, to which we ourselves were tyrannically doomed, and from which we have now every prospect before us of being delivered.'

'We esteem it a peculiar blessing, granted to us, that we are this day enabled to add one more step to universal civilization, by affording, as much as possible, the same to those who have lived in undeserved bondage, and from which, by the assumed authority of the Kings of Great Britain, no effectual legal relief could be obtained. Weak as we are, we flatter ourselves that we may be permitted, in the course of experience from those narrow prejudices and partialities we had imbibed, we find our hearts enlarged with kindness and benevolence towards men of all conditions and nations: and we conceive ourselves, at this particular period, extraordinarily called upon by the blessing which we have received, to manifest the sincerity of our professions, and to give a substantial proof of our gratitude.

'And whereas, the condition of those persons who have heretofore been denominated negroes and mulatto slaves, has been attended with circumstances, which not only deprived them of the common blessings that flow from liberty, but also, the bad law cast them into the deepest afflictions, by an unnatural separation and sale of husband and wife from each other, and from their children; an injury, the greatness of which is only equalled by the injustice of imposing that we were in the same unhappy case. In justice, therefore, to purpose so unhappily circumstanced, and, with the humble hope of relieving them, wherein they may rest, their sorrows and their hopes, have no reasonable indicement to render the aid to society, which, from their situation might, and also, in grateful commemoration of our own happy deliverance from that state of unconditional submission to which we were doomed by the tyranny of the King of Great Britain, that no child hereafter born, shall be a slave, &c.'

The slave trade was admitted to be an enormous offence against common humanity and right, and was given to the new Government to abolish it; and when the appointed time arrived, they did abolish it, with the general concurrence of all.

It is unknown, that any one, during any specific provision of the Constitution, nor any thing to be gathered from its general intent, or any sentiment or opinion in the minds of those who framed it, and who were among the greatest men of the country at the time, can warrant the belief that more was expected of the Government, than the prohibition to be established under it, that from the premises of the further importation of slaves from Africa, leaving the States which had slaves to do what they will, it is an affair of their own; and it is equally manifest, that the hopes of the wise and the good, the most ardent wishes of the most influential and patriotic men in the country, went to the total extinction and extension of slavery, but to its gradual abolition; and the highest intellects of the country were anxiously and earnestly considering of means by which that abolition might be best effected.

As significant of the fact that the framers of the Constitution, and the Government, had no idea of the notion of things which would be of temporary duration, we ask your attention to this circumstance. While the Constitution contains provisions adapted to the actual condition of the country, and, in order to recognize slavery in terms. The word slave, is not to be found in the Constitution. This omission is not accidental, would be clearly and necessarily inferred, from the careful circumlocution by which the idea of persons is provided for, without being named.

But we are not left to inference, however irresistible, to enable us to ascertain the reason of the omission. It was during the debate in the Convention of the Constitution of 1787.

An act contemporaneous with the formation of the Constitution throws a flood of light upon the purposes of the Fathers of the Republic.

In July, 1787, while the Convention that framed the Constitution was in session, the well known ordinance for the government of the Northwest territory was adopted, with but one dissenting vote, by the old Continental Congress. It provided, as we have seen, for the formation of States out of that territory. It also ordained that there should for ever after be no slavery, or involuntary servitude, in that region. It is remarkable that this ordinance extended its provisions over all the territories then possessed by the confederated States out of which new States should be formed, we have, in the form of permanent legislation, a solemn declaration of the purpose then entertained, not to permit slavery to spread beyond its original limits.

The theory, that the Constitution was made for the preservation, encouragement and expansion of slavery; that every new acquisition which freedom secured by the blood of our fathers, and the blessings of Heaven upon toil and enterprise, should be consecrated by the incorporation into the body politic by an equal portion of exotic slavery; and that every new extension of the area of freedom, and of beneficent causes, kindly placed beyond the control of man, should be retarded, by subjecting to the freezing influence of other regions, acquired by purchase, or fraud, or force, dates its discovery from a period long subsequent to the establishment of the Constitution.

Having shown that the Constitution was not designed to uphold slavery, and that such construction of it derives no aid from contemporaneous authority, we have shown, that the direct purpose for which the General Government was established, further inoperable objections to the measure under consideration.

What were those purposes? They are declared on the first page of the Constitution. They are, to establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity.' These are the declared objects for which the government was established, and the ends promoted by the extension of slavery?

Were there no purpose to enlarge the limits of domestic tranquillity, the opinions of the supporters of his prominent measure contend to leave the evil where the Constitution left it, that is, within its original bounds, it might seem ridiculous, in this Convention, to discuss the relations and condition of things existing in other States of the Union, over which Massachusetts has no control. But it must be remembered, that this measure, not instituted by this Convention, is forced upon it by an attempt to bring within the protection of the Constitution, and which it was established to ordain, preband, and to sustain, by its power, a new, because it did not crush, at once, an existing evil. We, therefore, ask, the advocates of the extension of slavery, if, in the language of the Poet, 'Is this the end of all our toil? Is this the end of all our hopes? Is this the end of all our hopes? Is this the end of all our hopes

THE LIBERATOR.

BOSTON, FEBRUARY 7, 1845.

THE FANEUIL HALL CONVENTION.

The late grand Anti-Annexation Convention in the Old Cradle of Liberty, on the score of numbers, exhibited moral worth, intellectual strength, and sound patriotism, was worthy of the renown of this ancient and well-honored Commonwealth. It was held without distinction of party; and though but few of the delegates were of the democratic (falsely so called) party, all that was patriotic and noble in the State was fully represented. The Address adopted on the occasion, which occupies the preceding page, was, as a whole, a most forcible and eloquent document, worthy to be read of all men, and to be preserved to the latest posterity. It was adopted unanimously, after a declaration, by Samuel J. May and myself, of that portion of it which apparently seeks to vindicate the Constitution from the charge of guaranteeing protection to slavery.

Of course, that bastard democratic journal, the Boston Post, and other kindred prints, are endeavoring to decry this Convention, and throw odium upon it. Base and futile attempt! What better can be expected of the political lacqueys who edit them? All good men, all genuine democrats, will regard them with indignation and abhorrence. They are to be associated with the vilest of the vile, and branded as the enemies of God and the human race. The black mockery of Benedict Arnold whitens into virtue, and becomes illustrious, in contrast with their democratic diabolism.

I find in the New-York Herald, the following report of the speech which I made on the proposition submitted by me to the Convention. As that speech was entirely unpremeditated and extemporaneous, and as the sketch in the Herald is the fullest and best that has been made of it, perhaps disjointed and inaccurate to some extent, I choose to copy what follows, as given by one inimical to the anti-slavery cause and myself, and therefore disposed to make 'the head and front of my offending' as bad as possible. At the worst, it is but a little extent—no more.

Wm. Lloyd Garrison, the celebrated leader of the abolitionists, was next called for from various parts of the hall, and came forward amidst the most rapturous demonstrations of applause. He said he came to second the resolution offered by Mr. Lovejoy, in the afternoon, for the recommitment of the address, and he would further move to instruct the committee to report an addition to the address, substantially as follows:—

'That in view of the fact, that two branches of the General Government have already declared their approbation of the annexation of Texas, we deem it our duty to declare what ought and will be the course of Massachusetts. Deeming it unconstitutional, we declare that the people will never submit to it as the law of the land; but will look upon the Union as dissolved, and proceed to form a new government of itself, with such of the free States as will join with her; and that if the committee to which this shall be referred be instructed to issue a call to the several towns of the State, to assemble and choose delegates for a convention to take the subject into consideration, and to unite with such States as choose to join Massachusetts, the Union of 1789 having by annexation been dissolved.'

This proposition of Mr. Garrison was received with great applause, and a few hisses. Referring to the latter, he said, he learned by that sound, that he had hit the nail on the head, and he called on the brave hearts before him to see that the nail was clenched. (Shouts of approbation; one chap called out treason.) Mr. G. said he represented 3,000,000 of slaves, in the Convention; all the free blacks, and the abolition party of the North. He said he believed the venerable President commend the abolitionists as the uncompromising friends of liberty. He claimed to be one, and he hoped to be one. He would explain, however, why he was here. The Hon. Mr. Phillips had stated that we were herein support of the Constitution and the Union. If the gentleman meant the Union *verus* annexation, then he was an unionist; if he meant the Constitution *versus* annexation, then he was a constitutionist. But if the gentleman meant to uphold the Constitution and Union, after the one had been violated and the other dissolved by annexation, then he was no unionist or constitutionalist. He would never uphold the unholy compromise of the Constitution with slavery, for his motto, as he was well known, was—'No union with slaveholders!' (Prolonged and deafening applause.) The question was, shall we spurn the Constitution—but had we any Constitution to support? Where stands Massachusetts at the present time? Are we the free and brave men of colored citizens in Southern States? Have not South Carolina and Louisiana declared war against Massachusetts? We have to be thrust out of the Union in the Southern States, and sold into perpetual bondage, if we dare to stand up in support of our honest sentiments. This was the Union and the Constitution, and the union they now enjoyed; and would they support it? He said he consented to be a member of the Convention, because he supposed it was to meet under the admission that Texas would be annexed, and so there would be no Constitution and no Union, and we must meet to form another. Who (the speaker inquired) needs to be told what we ought to do? The population of the Rev. Mr. Lovejoy was to declare that Massachusetts was freed from the obligation to support slavery by the annexation of Texas. Did he mean that because the South did an unconstitutional act, we should do another? Suppose that Texas were annexed, and the opponents of slavery should have the power in Congress, and should under the present Constitution, pass an act for the abolition of slavery throughout the Union—would not that, he asked, be a violation of the Constitution? He said that if the Convention meant to act upright, they would boldly declare the Union to be dissolved, when it was accursed with the blight and curse of the Constitution. He would deal fairly with the South; and if the Constitution was dissolved by annexation, as the Address declared it would be, let us go to work and form another. He hoped no more such action would take place as did when Missouri was admitted to the Union. The Massachusetts held a Convention, and issued an address, written by Mr. Webster, declaring a solemn protest against the measure. But Missouri was admitted, notwithstanding, as a slave holding State; and several other slave States had been admitted since, almost without a word of disapprobation. Other movements of the north, wordless, had, he asked, did they mean to act that farce over again? He said they must declare the Union null and void, and call on the free States to come over and help us; and if all faltered and held back, Massachusetts, with God and right on her side, was able to stand against the united world of slavery. (Great applause.) The Rev. gentleman then denounced, in the strongest terms, those democrats who had represented this Convention as a second edition of the Hartford Convention, and hailed his 'brother whigs' with joy in this good cause, and at length concluded with a quotation from the poet Whittier, expressing the hope of the speaker that; Massachusetts would be the foremost to make these free. He then sat down amidst the most hearty bursts of applause.

N. B. The reporter of the Herald is hereby informed that I am not a 'Rev. gentleman.'

Meeting of Colored Citizens. A large and highly respectable meeting of the colored citizens of Boston was held at the Belknap-street meeting-house on Monday evening last, to take into consideration the slave laws subjecting them to imprisonment on their arrival in southern ports, and also the expulsion of Messrs. Hoar and Hubbard from South Carolina and Louisiana. Several colored seamen came forward to testify to the sufferings and cruelties they had experienced in southern prisons, and much important testimony was elicited on that point. Appropriate remarks were made by Messrs. Wendell Phillips and W. L. Garrison. Highly pertinent resolutions were adopted, and also a memorial to the Legislature now in session in this city. [See the proceedings in another column.]

The Convention.—Whatever good the Anti-Annexation Convention might have accomplished, will be in a great degree neutralized by the treasonable project (we can view it in no other light) of Mr. Garrison, for withdrawing Massachusetts from the Union, under the specious plea that that Union becomes virtually dissolved in the bestowal of liberty on Texas. True, not half a dozen persons in the Convention would probably support this project; but still it goes out to attaint the proceedings, and to cause the enemies of the Union—the Texas advocates—a sneer, on wherewith to assail the whole doings of one of the most patriotic conventions ever assembled anywhere, for any purpose. It is indeed unfortunate that one hair-brained man should be permitted to defeat a wise and truly patriotic purpose; but we see no help for it. Mr. Garrison was not, we understand, a delegate to the Convention, and he professes to believe in the principle of a seaman government. He had, therefore, no right to intrude himself, either for good or for evil, upon the deliberations of that body.—*Boston Daily Mail of Friday.*

☞ The Faneuil Hall Convention ought to have thrown out Garrison's treasonable resolutions at once. Massachusetts will remain true to the Union, however other States may violate the clearest provisions of the national compact.—*Ibid.*

TREASONABLE PROJECT OF MR. GARRISON!

To the Editor of the Daily Mail:

Sir—I observe in the Mail of yesterday morning, a detailed paragraph purporting to be from a Faneuil Hall Convention, in which the proposition submitted by me to that body is denounced as 'treasonable.' That proposition was purely hypothetical, and simply provided for an emergency which appears to be inevitable, and which we must be prepared to meet in the spirit of freemen. In assuming that the Address, subsequently adopted by the Convention, explicitly set forth, that the annexation of Texas to the United States, in the form and for the purpose contemplated, would be not only an infraction of the Constitution, but 'the overthrow of the utter prostitution of all State rights, and a dissolution of the Union—it suggested the expediency of summoning another Convention of the People of Massachusetts, after the consummation of this frightful act of tyranny, to form a new government for themselves, the Union of 1789 having then ceased to exist. 'If this be treason, as Patrick Henry once exclaimed, 'make the most of it.' For a similar 'treasonable' doctrine, I refer to a somewhat 'blurred and tattered parchment,' called the Declaration of Independence:—'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed . . . That whenever *any form* of government becomes destructive of these ends, [the preservation of liberty and equality,] it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.'

You venture to say, what I will venture to question, that 'Massachusetts will remain true to the Union, however other States may violate the clearest provisions of the national compact.' Pray, do you deem such a declaration either patriotic or christian, you are ignorant of the quality of the Puritan spirit, dead to the inspiration of liberty, and blind to the signs of the times. Our revolutionary fathers did not say—'The colonies will remain true to the mother country, however the Parliament may violate the clearest provisions of the British Constitution.' No! They promptly repelled the slightest encroachments of their rights, and, unfurling the banner of revolution, inscribed on it—'Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God.' We, their descendants, who, claiming to be their descendants, and professing to glory in their indomitable spirit, have so basely degenerated as to cringe under the lash of the slave-driver, and to bow their necks to the yoke of tyranny, lest they be guilty of 'treasonable conduct!' Their slavish servility they dare not acknowledge. The 'clearest provisions of the national compact' are trampled upon by other States, expressly to extend and perpetuate slavery, Massachusetts will remain true to the Union, by declaring it to be no longer in existence, and by providing safeguards for her rights and liberties—and false to it by clinging to the form when the substance has vanished.

You say—'It is indeed unfortunate, that one hair-brained man should be thus permitted to defeat a truly wise and patriotic purpose.' And yet you add—'True, no half a dozen persons in the Convention would probably support this project; but still it goes out to attaint the proceedings'!! If this be reason, what is folly? Whatever may be the character of the project alluded to, I alone am responsible for it; and, most assuredly, I am prompt to take that responsibility. The Convention was not called together to deliberations and acts; and he who shall attempt to hold it accountable for the opinions or propositions of any of its members, will deserve to have the brand of FOOL or KNAVE stamped on his forehead. All that is *guilty* of, is the Address which it adopted, and the appointment of a committee of correspondence.

In your opinion, it ought to have thrown out Garrison's treasonable resolution at once.' The whole body of Southern slave-mongers will add, that the author of the resolution ought to have been thrown out along with it. This shows how wide, in this matter, you are in their company, they equal to my patriotism.'

My object, however, is not to defend myself against your absurd charge of treason, but to repel an insinuation which severely reflects on my honor and honesty as a man. You say—'Mr. Garrison is, we understand, a delegate to the Convention, and he professes to believe in the principle of no-human government. He had, therefore, no right to intrude himself, for good or evil, upon the deliberations of that body.' I care not for your opinion that I am a hair-brained man, but to correct an attempt to stain the integrity of my character, it is too grave a matter to be suffered to pass unnoticed. My right to sit as a member of that Convention was as valid as that of any other member. I was chosen as one of the delegates from Ward 10, (in which I reside,) with seven others, without a dissenting vote; and my certificate of membership, signed by the chairman and secretaries of the meeting, was duly presented to the Convention. It was, I have reason to believe, the most numerously attended Ward meeting held in the city. I submit to your sense of honesty, whether you ought not to have satisfied yourself of this libellous accusation to the public, without further inquiry.

In conclusion, allow me to say that, whatever may be my views of government, they do not disqualify me from joining an assembly of the people to protest against the annexation of Texas as a most wicked and unlawful act.

Requesting that you will insert this letter in your paper of Monday, as an act of personal justice and editorial fairness, I remain,

Yours, for universal liberty, and no union with slaveholders. WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

Boston, Feb. 1, 1845.

[It is due to the editor of the Mail to say, that he promptly complied with my request to publish the foregoing letter in the Mail of Monday last,—adding some remarks of his own, which require no rejoinder on my part. If his attacks upon me had been made by the editor of the *slaveocratic* Post or Times, I should have felt no surprise; but I did not think, widely as he may disagree with me on certain matters, that Mr. Purdy could believe me capable of being so dishonorable and base as to intrude myself upon the Faneuil Hall Convention as a delegate, without being duly chosen to appear as such. Patience, all—

☞ The annual reports of the New-Bedford, Providence and Salem Female Anti-Slavery Societies, and various other communications, shall have an insertion as soon as practicable.

☞ The 'Essex County Washingtonian' has altered its title to 'The Pioneer.' It is still edited by Henry Clapp, Jr.

MASSACHUSETTS AND TEXAS.

In the House of Representatives of this State, on Friday last—

Mr. Bell, from the Joint Special Committee, to whom was committed so much of the Governor's message as relates to the subject of Texas, also remonstrances of the House and petitions on the same subject, presented a Report, concluding with the following Resolutions:—

RESOLVES CONCERNING THE ADMISSION OF TEXAS.

1. Resolved, That Massachusetts has never delegated the power to any State to admit any Union, States or territories without or beyond the original territory of the States and territories belonging to this Union at the adoption of the Constitution of the United States; and that, in whatever manner the consent of Massachusetts may have been given or inferred to the admission of the States of Texas, by general consent, forming a part of the Union, from such territory, the admission of such States, in the judgment of Massachusetts, forms no precedent for the admission of Texas, and can never be interpreted to rest on powers granted in the Constitution.

2. Resolved, That Texas, not hitherto been no precedent of an admission of a foreign State or foreign territory into the Union by legislation. And as the power of legislation granted in the Constitution of the United States to Congress, do not embrace a case of the admission of a foreign State or foreign territory, by legislation, into the Union, such an act of admission would have no binding force whatever on the people of Massachusetts.

3. Resolved, That the power never having been granted by the people of Massachusetts, to admit into the Union any foreign State or territory, that the same when the Constitution was adopted, remains with the people,—and can only be exercised in such way and manner as the people shall hereafter designate and appoint.

4. Resolved, That the people of Massachusetts have never delegated to any other State, Union, or to themselves, to admit Texas, or any other State or territory, now without the Union, on any other basis than perfect equality of freemen, and that while slavery or slave-representation forms any part of the claims or conditions of admission, Texas, with their consent, can never be admitted.

In the House, on Saturday, 1000 extra copies of the Report on the subject of Texas were ordered to be printed. We hope to find room for it next week.

Resolutions in favor of the admission of Texas, have passed the Senate of Virginia, by a vote of 18 to 7. Similar resolutions have passed the House of Representatives of Michigan, by a vote of 31 to 16. Resolutions hostile to its admission have been adopted by the Legislature of New-Jersey—in the Assembly by a vote of 33 to 13—in the Senate unanimously. The House of Representatives of Maine have adopted resolutions against it, by a vote of 81 to 57, the resolutions in favor of the annexation of Texas, which were adopted by the Senate.

No action has yet been taken on this subject by the Senate of the United States.

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT.

The Thirteenth Annual Report, presented to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society by its Board of Managers, January 22, 1845,' (with an Appendix, containing the official proceedings at the annual meeting,) is now ready for delivery, in pamphlet form, at the Anti-Slavery Office, 25 Cornhill, Boston. It is from the pen of Edmund Quincy, the Corresponding Secretary, and takes a highly interesting and comprehensive survey of the leading events which have transpired during the past year, connected with the anti-slavery movement. It is like every previous Report of the series, a document, not merely of temporary interest, but crowded with facts and incidents of the times, to challenge the attention and assist the labors of the future historian. It concludes with these words:—Our conflict is one in which success is not in proportion to the numbers, but to the faithfulness of those who engage in it. We can look for no reward or glory, as the world calls such; but we can enjoy the high satisfaction of helping to carry forward the Great Event of our Age and Country—an event, the cleanest prospect of which, the increase of the hour fade and disappear. Next to the satisfaction of doing our duty to God and man, as we find it lying before us at our doors, it is a just and animating excitement to feel that we are permitted to partake in a passage of the world's history which can never be forgotten—which will affect the destinies of millions, till time is no more, and which will extend its influence into the unknown expanse of eternity.' We shall make some extracts hereafter for our columns.

THE TRAITOR PARMENTER.

Of all the Representatives from this State in Congress, only one was found so profligate and traitorous as to record his vote in favor of the annexation of Texas—and that man was WILLIAM PARMENTER, a professedly Simon Pure Democrat!! It might have been his vote and influence, which gave a majority in favor of this damning deed; and he is to be held just as sternly responsible for it as though he alone were guilty of it. Up to the hour of his unblushing apostacy, he had uniformly professed to be opposed to annexation, in common with the entire Democratic party of Massachusetts. By sinning, that he might be re-elected, he (like a mercenary Swiss) went over to the Slave Power, hoping no doubt that he shall obtain some governmental favor at the hands of James K. Polk. His political doom is in Massachusetts is sealed. Alluding to his recreancy, Whittier in the following lines, says:—

'And what, upon this tremendous question, was the voice of Middlesex in Congress? WILLIAM PARMENTER professes to be a Democrat—an apostle of that true Democracy which is the natural antagonism of slavery. His friends, for years, have claimed for him the votes of the abolitionists on the ground of his anti-slavery principles. He has himself publicly and privately professed himself utterly hostile to the continuance and extension of slavery. The voice of his own State had spoken, through her legislative assembly, against Texas annexation; the protest of thousands of his constituents against it, he had himself presented to Congress. All these were in the midst of anti-slavery influences—free breezes blow over it from the valley of the Concord and the plains of Lexington. Yet he has voted for Texas and eternal slavery! May God forgive him!'

☞ The 'Herald of Freedom,' we are happy to state, continues to be regularly published, and is doing good execution in the anti-slavery battle-field, under the management of the devoted Pillsbury. It was never more needed than at this crisis, when New-Hampshire is seeking to deepen her pro-slavery infamy by the adoption of the Texas and right Hale! We and trust will be vigorously sustained by the abolitionists of that State and elsewhere. As the editor has no salary, let him not be forgotten in the way of donations; for what mortal man can live upon thin air?

Send us a copy. William Goodell has written and published a pamphlet on the American Constitution, which the Liberty party journals praise very highly. Their praise of it is nothing in its favor; but if any body, by any possibility, can induce the sun to rise from the bond, or prove that a horse-chestnut is a chesnut horse, it is our friend Goodell. We should like to obtain a copy of his pamphlet; for if we have not yet arrived at the meaning and intent of the Constitution, and are wretchedly ignorant of the American Union, we desire to receive all the light on the subject which can be shed on our minds. What Mr. Goodell has undertaken to demonstrate, we do not precisely know; and we are not a little surprised that none of the Liberty party journals have yet made any extracts from its pages.

☞ A long communication from our friend N. P. Rogers, respecting the affair of the Herald of Freedom, was received too late for insertion this week. If his sake, we would gladly comply with it; but as it is plain to us, where it appears in the Liberator, we shall comply with it. We have read it with a heart overflowing with grief.

☞ Any person having a copy of the Liberator No. 19 of last year, will confer a great favor by sending it to this office, or to 25 Cornhill.

MEETING OF COLORED CITIZENS.

At a meeting of the colored citizens of Boston, held pursuant to public notice, in the Belknap-street meeting-house, on Monday evening, Feb. 4, 1845, Solomon R. Alexander was called to the chair, and Thomas Clark and Jeremiah Sanderson were chosen Vice-Presidents, and Robert Morris, Jr. and Chas. A. Battiste Secretaries. The following resolutions and memorial were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, it is expressly guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, that the citizens of one State shall enjoy all the rights and privileges of citizens of the several States; and

Whereas, it is proclaimed by Massachusetts, in her Bill of Rights, that all men are born free and equal; and by her laws, she knows nothing of caste or complexion among her people,—so that an insult or outrage done to any one of her inhabitants, by any other State or nation, is done to them all; and

Whereas, by the existence of slavery in a large portion of this country, the rights and liberties of the free colored citizens of Massachusetts are put in peril by other States, are frequently violated, and always placed in imminent peril; and

Whereas, the States of South Carolina and Louisiana have enacted laws, alike unconstitutional and atrocious, which they rigidly enforce, subjecting all people of Massachusetts, who may come into their ports, or be found on their soil, to imprisonment as felons, and subsequently to be sold as slaves to the highest bidder, in case their jail fees are not paid, and they transported in the vessels from which they were tyrannically taken; and

Whereas, these laws were recently banished from their limits, in an ignominious manner, the Hon. Samuel Hoar and the Hon. Henry Hubbard, who were sent thither under the authority of the Legislature and Executive of this Commonwealth, and in obedience to the voice of the people, in order to insure the protection of the colored citizens of Massachusetts within their borders, as far as it might legally be done, and to test the constitutionality of the slave laws aforesaid, by an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; and

Whereas, since the expulsion of those official agents, the Legislatures of South Carolina and Louisiana have enacted laws, making the residence on their soil of any person, holding a similar commission, a high misdemeanor, to be punished with fine and imprisonment; and have avowed their intention to disregard the decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court conflicting with their municipal regulations; but still at all hazards, as hitherto, to imprison, or, if necessary, enslave all free colored citizens of the non-slaveholding States who may be caught within their limits; and

Whereas, this is virtually to abrogate the Constitution of the United States, and to declare war against the North; therefore,

Resolved, That at a crisis so alarming, it behooves the people of the North to let their voices be heard in thunder tones against the outrageous extremities of despotic power,—to present an unbroken front to those perfidious and lawless States—to throw aside all party variances and sectarian animosities, and demand prompt and ample redress, a repeal of the oppressive laws alluded to, and a fulfilment of their constitutional obligations, on the part of South Carolina and Louisiana.

Resolved, That this is a question which has special manner concerns the free colored citizens of the North,—as they are the victims intended to be sacrificed on the altar of Southern jealousy and wrath, and therefore they are called on, most distinctively to enter their protest against such an unwarrantable persecution, to devise all proper means for their personal security, to appeal to their white fellow-citizens to stand by them in this time of peril, and to memorialize the Government for the succor and redress.

Resolved, That we, the colored citizens of Boston, assembled on this occasion, do most respectfully and earnestly call upon the Legislature and Executive of Massachusetts, in behalf of the colored citizens of the State, not to consent to our enslavement, or imprisonment, or even to allow a small portion of the population, and are identified by complexion with such of our unfortunate countrymen as are held in chains and slavery at the South;—but to vindicate the Constitution of the Commonwealth,—her self-respect and honor,—her sacred obligations as a sovereign State,—the rights of all her people as equally sacred; to yield nothing to Southern dictation; to make no compromise in this conflict with the fierce demon of slavery; and to maintain 'free trade and sailors' rights.'

Resolved, That these proceedings, signed by the Chairman and Secretary of this meeting, be presented to the Legislature now in session in this city, together with the following Memorial to that body:

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

The memorial of the undersigned, colored citizens of Massachusetts, respectfully sheweth,

That, while treating with the utmost scorn of the Senate, striking from the statute-book the last relic of any distinction on account of color, will soon become law, they look with pride and satisfaction on the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth, and wait patiently till the enlightened and liberal sense of public feeling shall secure to them the full enjoyment of all the rights which impartial laws have conferred: they view alike with alarm and indignation the recent enactments of Louisiana and South Carolina, in relation to any persons who shall, either living or coming there, come within the prohibition, inveighing the laws of those States, by which such colored seamen are employed in the vessels of the State, are subjected to fines, imprisonment, and disgraceful restraints in southern ports.

They entreat your Honorable bodies to remember that in all the history of the States, they shall equally with others; that in times of public danger, their exertions have been equally called for and freely offered; and that on every account they are entitled, as useful and good citizens, to the protection of Government in all the rights of citizenship.

They ask in behalf of themselves, that the free exercise of those callings, against which these Southern laws are pointed, is necessary to many of them for procuring subsistence, and that the same princeless which defined in the United States Constitution, forbid such employment of the National power, as came effects to any other class when fitting occasion may arise. They do not either affirm or deny that their exclusion from Southern ports is necessary for the security of slave masters; but, seeing that such exclusion is plainly unconstitutional, if any one affirms it to be necessary, they claim of your Honors, and then it follows that slavery and the Constitution cannot exist together, and your memorialists will not permit themselves to doubt which Massachusetts in such case would prefer. Finally, your memorialists ask that their case may not, one account of a distinction of color, be separated from the general interests of the whole mass of citizens, but that all may stand or fall together—and therefore protesting against all this kind of southern legislation, both in relation to themselves and Messrs. Hoar and Hubbard, as utterly unconstitutional and void, they pray, in any opinion to the President of the United States, or by such other means as your wisdom shall suggest, this grievous evil may be removed.

Resolved, That the position, which our esteemed pioneer of Liberty, William Lloyd Garrison, took in the Anti-Texas Convention in Faneuil Hall—his calm and fearless expression of his principles as to the course proper for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to take, in case Texas is annexed—is, in our opinion, the only position which a State can take, which holds the laws of God paramount to any enacted by man.

Resolved, That the President of this meeting, with John T. Hilton and Wm. C. Nell, be a committee to inform Thomas Clarkson of Ipswich, George Thompson of London, Richard D. Webb of Dublin, and William Smeal of Glasgow, of the fact that the colored seamen of Great Britain are subjected to imprisonment in Southern ports; and urge the honorable gentlemen of that land to take proper action in the premises.

Voted, That the various city papers be respectfully requested to give these proceedings an insertion in their columns.

SOLOMON R. ALEXANDER, *Chairman.*

ROBERT MORRIS, JR. } *Secretaries.*
CHARLES A. BATTISTE, }

REMINISCENCES OF THE FAIR.

Dear Mr. Garrison:—

In sketching the outline of the Fair, last week, I did not attempt any filling up; but on looking it over in print, I am struck by imperfections in the outline. How could I have omitted the names of the lady Delilahs and Samsons, who, by doing can justify the overnight but the fact that the pressure of anti-slavery affairs, at the time of writing, was uncommonly severe.

No tables were prettier, or more available to the cause, than those two Gideons, with the banner of true-blue and gold, upon which hearts to bear up that banner, in spite of all obstacles, was on the ground at the earliest hour of rendezvous; and by its beautiful arrangement of exquisitely wrought articles, gave an impetus to the flood-gate of business in that part of the hall. Edward Davis of Philadelphia, will be glad to hear that it was by such hands that a part of his donation of silks was doubled in value to the treasury. Dednah was not a whit behind, the very chiefest. Its beautiful sheaves of dried grasses and waving forms, and autumn-tinted leaves, now lend an added grace to the city drawing-rooms, where its tapestried flowers are in high repute.

The sum of $5, credited to Charlotte Austin, should have been placed to the account of Charlotte Austin Joy. M. W. C.

Case of Jonathan Walker.—A message from the Governor of Massachusetts, was sent to the Senate a few days ago, inclosing a report of a committee of the Council on a memorial of certain citizens of the State respecting the case of Jonathan Walker, who is chained in prison at Pensacola, charged with being concerned in the abduction of six slaves. He is being tortured to death by a man of Southern blood, and the Governor is invoked to interpose, by furnishing him counsel and other means of relief.

The committee of the Council, of which his Honor John Reed, the Lieutenant-Governor, is chairman, report that the Executive has no jurisdiction in the matter, and no authority to provide counsel, or in any manner to use the Power of the State for the purpose asked in the memorial. The Governor, however, directed the Secretary of State to write to the Governor of Florida on the subject, which he was accordingly done, but no answer has been returned.

In the Massachusetts House of Representatives on Monday, a petition was presented from Luther Wait, and others, of Ipswich, which the Boston Post thinks of 'very ridiculous character,' and 'trifling with the right of petition.' The petition prays that the 'certain yellow and russet-colored citizens of S. Carolina' had assumed the government of that State, to the entire exclusion of the majority of the native born citizens; that they have passed laws in contravention of the U. S. Constitution; that they are a disorderly, unfaithful and treacherous race; that they ought not to be permitted to come to Massachusetts, and, if found there, should be imprisoned, and treated in the same way that colored citizens of DeWolf are treated when found in South Carolina, &c.

We cannot see in what respect this *petition* is more ridiculous than the actual conduct of South Carolina and Louisiana.

Annexation Projects.—There were *only* fourteen projects for the annexation of Texas to the Union, in the House and five in the Senate, viz.:

Senate.—1st. The bill of Mr. C. J. Ingersoll, based upon the Tyler treaty.
2d. The proposition of Mr. Weller.
3d. The amendment of Mr. Dix, of Maine.
4th. The substitute of Mr. Belser.
5th. The plan of Mr. Fairfield.
6th. The bill of Mr. McDowell.
7th. The bill of Mr. Dromgoole.
8th. The plan of Mr. Mr. Hor.
9th. The plan of Mr. Milton Brown.

And, in the Senate:

1st. The Tyler treaty plan of Mr. McDuffie.
2d. The plan of Col. Benton.
3d. The plan of Mr. Niles.
4th. The plan of Mr. Sevier.
5th. The plan of Mr. Haywood.

The Speech of Mr. Adams, in opposition to the annexation of Texas, is acknowledged by those who were so fortunate as to hear it, to be emphatically *the* speech of the session on that subject. The speech is said to have been a little 'Old Man Eloquent' finally brought up on Friday last, the day before the final division was taken, and the Northern Whigs are said to have demolished all the miserable fallacies and historical blunders of the spouters and drivellers who have been laboring for weeks to defend the proposed abomination.

The Boston Post is denouncing John P. Hale for his recent speech in the U. S. Senate, and publishes in its columns the name of Henry Williams as a candidate for Congress in the Ninth District in this State. Mr. Williams has just voted against Texas annexation. Why not throw him overboard?

O Shame! where is thy blush?—A salute of 100 guns was fired on Boston Common, on Tuesday, in honor of the passage of the annexation bill through the House of Representatives of the U. S.

Very Kind in Him.—Governor Mouton of Louisiana, says he is in favor of the annexation of Texas, although the benefits to the North will be greater than to the South.

The Boston Times is republishing the statistics in the U. States census relating to free blacks, just as if they had not been proven false months ago.

The *sixth* trial for a choice of Mayor of Boston, has again resulted in no choice. Mr. Parker, Whig, lacks 2 votes of a majority. (Am. Repub.) 4429; (Dem.) 1504; scattering, 40.

Mr. Dorr.—The Boston Post says that Mr. Dorr would have availed himself of the Act for his liberation, had it required of him to sign a bond to keep the Providence Journal says that the only disabilities under which he would labor, if liberated under the Act, are an incapacity to hold civil offices, and to give testimony as a witness; and that these will be removed by a special act of the General Assembly, whenever Mr. Dorr petitions for it.

Murder in Worcester.—Mr. Orrin DeWolf has been arrested in Worcester, on a charge of having murdered William Stiles, on Wednesday evening of last week. Mr. Williams has been seen walking arm in arm together to a notorious house, a few miles from the town, where they both got drunk. DeWolf was seen to get Stiles backed into a corner in a bank in Whipple's stable, where DeWolf was in the habit of working. He then went for the doctor, who, on arriving, found Stiles dead, with certain marks on his neck, as if strangulation had taken place, and DeWolf was arrested on suspicion of the murder. He has been suspected of a criminal connection with the wife of Stiles, and has been heard to say that he would have the mangement of Stiles's money.

☞ Let all attend, who can!

GREAT ATTRACTION—SPLENDID FAIR—AND TREMENDOUS ANTI-SLAVERY GATHERING AT FITCHBURG!!

The ladies of Worcester North, in connection with the people of the Massachusetts Fair, will hold a splendid Fair at Fitchburg, on Wednesday and Thursday, Feb. 12th and 13th, consisting of a great variety of fancy and useful articles from England, Scotland, Ireland, and from various sections of our own State. All who would desire to forward the cause of Freedom, by aiding in raising funds, or making gain, are earnestly desired to attend. A refreshment table will be provided at a reasonable price, for the benefit of the Fair. In connection with the Fair, the annual meeting of the Worcester North Anti-Slavery Society will be held. All we need say to present the interest of the meeting and the Fair, is, that the inimitable eloquence of Wendell Phillips, and the sweet logic and solemn appeals of Adin Ballou, and the charming music of the Hutchinson Family from the Granite State, will all speak to the meeting. Let the young people especially, of all the surrounding towns, rush to Fitchburg, like the waves of the sea.

In behalf of the meeting; per order,

J. T. EVERETT,
BENJ. SNOW, Jr.

MARRIED—In this city, at the Tremont Temple, on Thursday evening, Feb. 6, by the Rev. Rufus Ellis, Oliver, Mr. George W. Saunders to Miss Sarah J. Mann. [We acknowledge the receipt of a generous slice of the wedding cake, and wish the twain who are now one a life of felicity.]—Ed. Lib.

FAIR FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES.

The Ladies of the First Independent Baptist Female Society intend holding a Fair for their benevolent purposes, as a benefit for said Church, and have appointed the following persons as Managers, and to solicit aid in the Fair:

E. R. Davis,	H. A. Ravelion,
Susan Raymond,	Martha Lockley,
R. Washington,	Susan Harrison,
Caroline F. Williams,	Frances Clark,
Ann Telford,	Cordelia Howard,
C. A. Lee,	Augusta Jackson.

The aforesaid Committee most respectfully call the attention of the public to their undertaking; whose generosity they earnestly solicit.

Favors, however small, will be gratefully received at Mrs. Howard's, Poplar-street; Mrs. Ritto, Belknap street; Mrs. Washington's, Smith Court; Mrs. J. T. Reynolds, Southac street; E. R. Davis, 53 Spring street; Mrs. Hilton's, Cambridgeport.

Being the first time they have called upon the public for favors, they hope to receive a liberal share of their patronage.

E. R. DAVIS, *President.*

Ellen Garrison, *Secretary.*
Boston, Jan. 20th, 1845.

FAIR AT UPTON!

There will be a Fair for the benefit of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, to be held commencing on Wednesday, Feb. 19th. Edmund Quincy will lecture at the same place on the previous evening.—The friends of anti-slavery principle will do well to desire to aid the cause of the oppressed, in Upton, and in the neighboring towns, are strongly solicited to bestow their generous aid on this occasion, in a spirit of liberality worthy of its great and humane object.

GREAT CONVENTION!

The Massachusetts Society for the Abolition of Capital Punishment, will hold a Convention in the Hall of the House of Representatives on the evening of February tenth, at 7 o'clock.

Robert Rantoul, Jr., Wendell Phillips, Dr. Walter Channing, Rev. John Pierpont, Rev. E. H. Chapin, and other distinguished friends of the cause are expected to address the meeting.

NOTICE.

The Directors of the Boston Freedom Association tender their thanks to the public for their patronage at a Levee, held in Tremont Chapel, under the Boston Museum, January 1st, 1845, for the benefit of the N. E. Freedom Association. And a vote of thanks for a donation, given to the Directors, for the benefit of Fugitives, from a gentleman unknown; the sum, $10. Per order of the Directors,

Robert Wood, *Sec'y.*

Boston, Jan. 29th, 1845.

ADELPHIC UNION LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

The lecture on Tuesday evening, Feb. 11th, at the Tremont Chapel, will be delivered by Josiah Quincy, Esq. To commence at 7 1-2 o'clock precisely.

CHARLES A. BATTISTE, *Sec'ry.*

ANTI-SLAVERY LECTURES.

Henry Richards Chrimell, Agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, will lecture in behalf of the same, at

Newton,	Sunday,	February 9.
Waltham,	Monday,	" 10.
Lexington,	Tuesday,	" 11.
Bedford,	Wednesday,	" 12.
Westford,	Thursday,	" 13.
Littleton,	Friday,	" 14.
Acton,	Sunday,	" 16.
Concord,	Monday,	" 17.
Boxborough,	Wednesday,	" 19.
Sudbury,	Friday,	" 21.
Framingham,	Sunday,	" 23.
Sherburne,	Tuesday,	" 25.
Holliston,	Thursday,	" 27.
Upton,	Sunday,	March 2.
Northridge,	Tuesday,	" 4.

☞ Our anti-slavery friends in the several towns named above are requested to make suitable arrangements for the lecture, and to invite the aid of the colored friend of fine talents and address, and has had some practice in lecturing.]—*Ed. Lib.*

EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY!

THE NORTHAMPTON ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY have appropriated a suitable tenement for the accommodation of a few more boarding scholars. They will be members of a family, under the care of the Director of Education, assisted by his wife and other teachers, and will be subjected to the same treatment and regulations as pupils who are members of the Association. The Association is based upon the noble idea of culture, towards the realization of which our efforts will be directed. Systematic, habitual industry is deemed indispensable to a healthy development, should aim at the harmonious development of the physical, intellectual, moral and religious tendencies in active, practical life.

We shall consider $100 a year (one half in advance,) as an equivalent for instruction and board, which is plain and without fashion. Deductions from this deduction will be made when a pupil comes for several years. Pupils will be received for a year at any time.

REFERENCES.—Rev. Theodore Parker, *Excusatis.*
Brookfield Meadows, *Northampton, Feb. 1st, 1845.*

☞ Papers friendly to a reorganization of society upon the basis of the laws of God and the nature of man, are requested to notice the above advertisement.

Feb. 7 2m

WHAT FAMILY WILL BE WITHOUT IT?

Ten copies sent for one year to one address for TEN DOLLARS.

New-York or Eastern funds, free from loss or discount, remitted free of expense through the Postmaster.

GREAT NATIONAL MAGAZINE.

AGENTS WANTED.

READING FOR ALL!

TO THE READING PUBLIC.

The Best and Cheapest Family Magazine in America!

POETRY.

From Longfellow's new work, entitled 'The Waif.'

POEM.

BY H. W. LONGFELLOW.

The day is done, and the darkness
Falls from the wings of Night,
As a feather is wafted downward
From an eagle in its flight.

I see the lights of the village
Gleam through the rain and the mist,
And a feeling of sadness comes o'er me,
That my soul cannot resist;

A feeling of sadness and longing,
That is not akin to pain,
And resembles sorrow only
As the mist resembles the rain.

Come, read to me some poem,
Some simple and heart-felt lay,
That shall soothe this restless feeling,
And banish the thoughts of day.

Not from the grand old masters,
Not from the bards sublime,
Whose distant footsteps echo
Through the corridors of time:

For, like strains of martial music,
Their mighty thoughts suggest
Life's endless toil and endeavor;
And to-night I long for rest.

Read from some humbler poet,
Whose songs gushed from his heart,
As showers from the clouds of summer,
Or tears from the eyelids start;

Who, through long days of labor,
And nights devoid of ease,
Still heard in his soul the music
Of wonderful melodies.

Such songs have power to quiet
The restless pulse of Care,
And come like the benediction,
And the amen of prayer.

Then read from the treasured volume,
The poem of thy choice;
And lend to the rhyme of the poet,
The beauty of thy voice.

And the night shall be filled with music,
And the cares that infest the day,
Shall fold their tents, like the Arabs,
And as silently steal away.

SLEEPING AND WATCHING.

BY ELIZABETH B. CHANDLER.

Sleep on, Baby, on the floor,
Tired of all the playing—
Sleep with smile the sweeter for
That you dropped away in!
On your curls' full roundness, stand
Light and smiling serenely—
One cheek, pushed out by the hand,
Folds the dimple inly:
Little head and little foot
Heavy laid for pleasure,
Underneath the lids half-shut,
Slants the shining azure—
Open-souled in noonday sun,
So, you lie and slumber!
Nothing evil having done,
Nothing can encumber.
I, who cannot sleep as well,
Shall I sigh to view you?
Or sigh further to foretell
All that may undo you?
Nay, keep smiling, little child,
Ere the sorrow neareth,—
I will smile too! Patience mild
Presents token sweetest.
Nay, keep sleeping before loss;
I shall sleep, though losing!
As by cradle, so by cross,
Sure is the reposing.

And God knows, who sees us twain,
Child at childish leisure,
I am near as tired of pain
As you seem of pleasure—
Very soon too, by His grace
Gently wrapt around me,
Shall I show as calm a face,
Shall I sleep as soundly!
Differing in this, that you
Clasp your playthings, sleeping,
While my hand shall drop the few
Given to my keeping;
Differing in this, that *I*,
Sleeping, shall be colder,
And in waking present,
Brighter to beholder!
Differing in this beside,
(Sleeper, have you heard me?
Do you move, and open wide
Eyes of wonder toward me?)
That while I you dress and bathe
From your slumber, solely—
Me, from mine, an angel shall,
With reveille holy!

ISABEL.

BY CHARLES G. EASTMAN.

Hush! her face is chill,
And the summer blossom,
Motionless and still,
Lieth on her bosom.

On the shroud so white,
Like snow in winter weather,
Her marble hands unite
Quietly together.

How like sleep, the spell,
On her lids that falleth!
Wake, sweet Isabel!
Lo! the morning calleth!

How *like* sleep?—'tis death.
Sleep's own gentle brother;
Heaven holds her breath—
She is with her mother!

From the New-Orleans Picayune.

TO MY SHADOW.

Shadow, just like the thin regard of men,
Constant and close to friends and fickle fortune's bright,
You leave me *in the dark*, but come again
And stick to me *as long as there is light*.
Yet, shadow, as good friends have often done,
You've never stepped *between* me and the sun;
But ever *followed back* me, I have found you;
Altho', indeed, you'ty fond of *changing sides*,
And, while I never yet could 'get around' you,
Where'er I walk, my shadow with me glides.
That you should leave me in the dark is meet
Enough, there being one thing to remark;
Light calls you forth, yet, lying at my feet,
I'm keeping you *forever* in the dark.

PHAEMAL.

From the New-York Tribune.

FREEDOM.

FREEDOM, not armed with buckler, as of old,
And horred blade, but weaponless, shall march
To bloodless victory; her sword, a wreath
Of flowers, by all the nations wove;
Her creed as liberal as thought; her home
This teeming world, over whose broad domain
CHILDHOOD and YOUTH and MANHOOD, AGE
With Woman set from tyrant-shackles free,
And taught to know her loveliness and worth,
Shall tearless walk, singing high songs
With all the quick-eyed elements, in this,
Their sinless home.

REFORMATORY.

For the Liberator.

THE CHURCH AND CLERGY.

That the claim by the present Church, of being the Church of Christ, is false, I cannot believe any honest mind, which is acquainted with its character, and with the character and teachings of Christ, can doubt for a moment. To every enlightened lover of truth, its hypocrisy must be apparent.

It is difficult to imagine any wider extremes, than the religion of Christ, and the religion of the Church, as a body. They are as different as light from darkness.

The religion of Christ is benevolence—love. His life was one full of acts of mercy—of kindness—of sympathy with those in distress, administered not at convenience, but by self-sacrifice—by denying himself personal ease, and even the necessaries of life—by making himself the man of sorrows—by giving the condition of the beasts of the field, and the birds of the air, was enviable to his. Says he, 'The foxes have holes, the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head.' And what are the precepts and teachings of Christ? The greatest, the noblest, the human mind can conceive. His language was, 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; if thine enemy hunger, feed him—if he thirst, give him drink; give to him that asketh of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away; and unto him that smiteth thee on one cheek, turn the other also; and in all things, as ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them; for if ye love them that love you, what thank have you, for sinners do even the same; but do good and lend, hoping for nothing again.'

I can see no ambiguity in such language. It is so plain, that none need misunderstand it. But men, generally, do not wish to understand the precepts of Christ. Instead of going to them for doctrine, they manufacture their own, and then by all the sophistry and false-reasoning they can command, labor to cramp them to it, and confirm their lie.

I believe it to be so with the prevalent religion of the present day. I believe I am authorized by Christ himself to make the imputation. For what is it, as a general thing, but a name—a lifeless carcass? I wonder how any man, with moral perception not completely blinded, can consider it for a moment, without being filled with ineffable loathing.

Instead of being a light to the world, it is darkness to the world. It is struggling with all its might to keep the light from the world.

Its principle characteristic is its love of darkness. There is scarcely a sin which is not permitted to take refuge in it. Around slavery, 'the sum of all villanies, the vilest system that ever saw the sun,' it throws its defence. Nor does it at this crisis, when the evil is attacked by the world, (as the church calls all out of it,) leave it with a common defence. Nay, the crisis demands a special defence, which has been promptly and heartily responded to, by its D. D's, Bishops and Reverends, and in fact, by almost all its reputed great men, North and South. Nor is this all. In order more effectually to check the tide of feeling which is increasing against slavery, it has raised the cry of '*infidelity*,' and charged the cause with being a great 'infidel enterprise,' and those engaged in it with having another object in view, besides the abolition of slavery; with making this a hobby, a mere pretence, their real object being the destruction of the church. And it has succeeded in blinding and degrace the characters of individuals of influence engaged in the cause, in order to curtail their influence. It has raised and countenanced mobs, dragged out of its pulpits those who are mouth for the dumb, ejected them from their meeting-houses, and bolted their doors against them. All this it has done in the defence of slavery, because it has known that anti-slavery, in pursuit of its object, must eventually erase it to its hiding place, the bosom of the Church, where it has been baptized, 'sanctified and sanctified.' Its ministers have been careful to watch—not 'for souls,' but, for the peace of the churches. As a general thing, they have been lulling into a death-like slumber all those over whom they have had any influence. They have made themselves notorious in defending and apologizing for this abominable system. They have welcomed to their pulpits, as good ministers of Christ, those who have just come from the slave mart, where they had filled their pockets with the price of human blood—with the price of God's image—perhaps Jesus Christ himself in the person of a disciple. It has sanctified not, as a general thing, with the professed ministers of Christ, that their professed master was daily bought and sold in the market with cattle, horses and swine, to the highest bidder. The course of the Church and its ministers, in regard to slavery alone, is enough to satisfy any reasonable mind of their utter recreancy. But this is not all. It operates human butchery by the wholesale—it 'sanctions and sanctifies' a custom which brings together nominally Christian nations, separated by some little point of difference, to shoot down each other like brutes—the more there are killed, the more glorious the battle. Where professed Christians, coming out of the church where they had prayed God to make them successful in slaughtering *their* enemy, at the same time, praying *Him* to forgive their trespasses as they forgave those who trespassed against them—meet each other face to face, and blow each other's brains out, and then go to the bar of God together, to receive the welcome plaudit, '*Well done!* But, say the Church and her ministers, this is all right; 'it is indispensable to national dignity; yes, to the existence of nations.'

'Christ said, 'Love your enemies, and do them good; bless them that curse you.' Yet so, says the Church, but meet them, and blow their brains out.

Christ said, 'If a man smite thee on one cheek, turn to him the other also.' Says the Church, 'Maintain your dignity,—it is indispensable to your existence.' 'An eye for an eye.' But this is not all.

It has created a great mass of subterfuges. Disregarding that lovely precept of Christ, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,' each one is left to make a god of himself. The common motto is '*gain*.' For this they rise early, and work late—toil, toil, toil, year in and year out; can get no time to serve God, and do good to their fellow-men. They can't afford time for feeding the hungry, or clothing the naked, or respecting the oppressed. They 'have a large minister's tax to pay,' and they can do nothing more, as a general thing.

There are some, however, who feel a great deal for the *heathen among us*. They are moved to compassion, they hear of the destitution, superstition, and ignorance of the poor Burmans, Karens and Hindoos, &c. But they cannot see a sixth part of our own population in as dark heathenism,—by the testimony of Southern synods,—as any on the face of the globe. Their general vision is very strong when it is aimed across the Atlantic. It can penetrate the Chinese wall, the jungles of farther India, the deserts and forests of Africa, or the icebergs of Greenland; but it entirely fails them when turned toward the rice swamp, the sugar plantation, the cotton and tobacco field of the South.

I do not complain that they see too clearly the wants of the heathen afar off, or that they are too easily melted into compassion for them, or that they do too much for them. Nay, I blame them that they do not feel more for them; but I blame them still more that they have no sympathy, no compassion for our heathen at home,—for those we have made heathen; and while they profess so much anxiety to do away heathenism, that they nurture, sustain and defend the great heathen-making system of Slavery. Is the Church of Christ there is no compromise with sin—no union with the world—no loving and observing its superlatively wicked fashions—no rich, no poor, high or low. Christianity is a levelling principle. But how different is American Christianity! Belonging to one Church are master and slave; the men of hundreds of thousands, and the beggar.

Depend upon it, the day is close at hand when the prevalent religion of this day will, by all the wise and good, by every lover of righteousness and the cause of Christ, be classed with the Jewish priesthood; when it will be set by the side of the religion of the Scribes and Pharisees. What Christ said of them, is true of the great mass of professors of religion at the present day. 'They tithe mint and rue, anise and cummin, and neglect the weightier matters, judgment and mercy.' Their religion is purely selfish. Their object is not to do good, but to escape hell. By embracing such a religion, they do not cut themselves asunder from the world; they can worship self as much as before. They do not lose the friendship of the world. No; the people of the world, generally, speak well of this religion, they respect it highly in defence of it, whenever it is called in question. Speak evil of it, and it produces a sensation as sharp in the world, as in the Church. And why? Because the Church is on terms of friendship with the world. Does the world love the Church? Yes, and the world and the Church have two great allies. They serve mammon together—they worship together at the shrine of fashion—they have confederated together to grind the face of the poor, by compelling them, by withholding from them the necessaries of life, to work without wages or without an equivalent. Such, then, is the Church of the present day. A kingdom of this world. Does not the fact, that it is on terms of friendship with the world, prove it to be so? For Christ said, 'The friendship of the world is enmity with God.' Again, 'The world shall hate you, because ye are not of the world. If ye were of the world, the world would love you.' 'We are unto you when all men shall speak well of you.'

And thus we might go on, and contrast the different characteristics of the religion of Christ, and the prevalent religion of the present day. The latter has been stript of every thing by which it is Christ, to make it unobjectionable to the world. Its votaries richly merit that woe which is pronounced upon those of whom all men speak well.

And what are the ministers of this religion? Are they faithful to the people—the people under their herds? I believe they are, generally, men who watch the fleece more than the flock. Their very course proves them to do so. Instead of going forth as did the Apostles, and preaching a free gospel, relying on Christ, who has promised that all these things should be added to those who seek first his kingdom,' they place themselves upon the auction stand, to be struck off to the highest bidder. They say, 'Here, we will give you so much gospel, for so much money.

While they claim to be *especially called* to preach the religion of the meek and lowly Jesus, who was so poor he had not where to lay his head, they far too generally manifest an unwillingness to preach at all, unless they can have a salary which is equivalent to an elegant living. It is too evident, that too many of them care more to be placed over some flourishing Society, where a worldly peace reigns, where their labors will not be very severe, where they can have a fine salary, and a people who think a great deal of ministers, and esteem them as semi-divine, and call them 'Rabbi, Rabbi,' and are 'very kind and attentive to their pastor,' than they care for the promotion of the cause of Christ.

But what do they preach? Christ came to 'preach the gospel to the poor,—they prefer to preach it to the rich,—for the poor have not wherewith to pay for the gospel. He came 'to heal the broken-hearted—to preach deliverance to the captive,' &c. The tendency of their preaching, I fear, is to heal the majority, in a broad sense, to separate husbands and wives—parents and children—brothers and sisters; to carry despair to the bosom of the captive slave, and rivet his chains still stronger. They dare not preach the truth, because it displeases the people.

In all the great reforms of the present day, the Ministry and Church, instead of taking the lead as they would have done, had they been the Ministry and Church of Christ, have modestly stood in the background, and attended at the heels of the world. They have been lighted by the world, instead of lighting it. Is this the Church of Christ, which is like a city set on a hill, whose light cannot be hid? Is it not rather, the synagogue of Satan—the great Babylon, concerning whom, John heard the proclamation in heaven: 'Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues?'

M.

☞ The following article, though from a Catholic source, contains some very just animadversions.

NATIONAL SABBATH CONVENTION.

This heterogeneous assembly from various States in the East and South, met in Baltimore on the 27th of November, and has been engaged in some form for the stricter observance of the Sabbath. Whether the proceedings will have much effect on the nation is matter of doubt, and whether during its session much bad feeling was exhibited, is quite certain, as the notes of the Reporters very clearly prove. The Hon. John Quincy Adams presided, and on the Committee of Arrangements, was appointed '*the* Sabbath' not the Sabbath *indefinitely*, that it was invulnerable. As a general rule, he always obeyed the commands of God and the Commandments of the blessed day, but as to the diversity of opinion which existed relative to the mode of its observance, he had not paid sufficient attention to enable him to view the question in its bearing.' At the very outset of the deliberations, a truly Protestant scene was acted, exceedingly characteristic of the reformers. A Presbyterian had been appointed to open the Convention 'gratefully recognize the goodness of Jehovah in the appointment of the Sabbath,' but one of the members opposed it on the light of private interpretation, asserting that there was no Sabbath in the New Testament to justify the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, and wishing to amend the resolution by substituting in place of the Sabbath, the words more orthodox in his opinion, 'the Lord's day.' Here was matter for contention! A terrible clamor was made. The chair was called to order, and the *authority* whereby he claimed to preside in the Convention demanded! Some wished to know whether they were to settle the differences between the Papist and Protestant, the Jew and Christian, the Baptist, for if they were required to do so, they might as well adjourn at once. Rev. Mr. Dubin, to calm the agitation of his fellow Protestants, very simply remarked that they had met to adopt measures for the *better* observance of the Sabbath—not to determine which is the Sabbath—thereby intimating that the 'Bible alone was not sufficient proof' on the subject. A Mr. Magruder from Virginia sustained the views of Mr. Lemmon, who gave the first note to this Protestant concert of the Sabbath, and had boldly declared that the Sabbath which Mr. Magruder would introduce, would be of such a character 'as was not to be found on the earth, above the earth, or in the waters that were under the earth.' Mr. Magruder replied, asserting in the course of his remarks, 'that it was an utter *impossibility to keep the Christian Sabbath*!' This was a candid expression of his opinion in the exercise of private judgment of Scripture, which was, of course, intolerable to those Protestants who had no other guide than the Bible. He was interrupted with hisses and cries of order, whilst many persons in the gallery cried, 'turn him out!' Mr. Hammond of Pennsylvania deplored the confusion, and very sensibly observed, 'I remember the tears—he said that he *could* shed tears; but as no one seconded the motion, it does not appear that he did shed them.' Had he had time to do so, he would, no doubt, have been a very interesting spectacle.

The Convention having succeeded in restoring harmony, a very elaborate address was made on steamboats, railroads, and locomotive engines, one of the speakers stating how much his feelings were agonized by hearing 'Engines puffing as it were in the face of heaven, a bold defiance against the God of the Sabbath.' The Rev. Mr. Danforth reprimanded a 'negro for travelling in a steamboat on Sunday! Yes, O! horror of horrors! the negro told him that there was a preacher on board! The question now arose, what was necessary and what was not necessary travelling. The following speech by a Mr. Parker from New-York, will best explain the profound views of the Convention on this subject:

Mr. Parker, of New-York, addressed the Convention on the subject of unnecessary travel on the Sabbath day, illustrating his argument by the case of a little girl who lived at Brooklyn, but made it a practice to come across the ferry every Sunday morning to New-York, to attend as a member of a Sabbath School. There were plenty of Sabbath Schools in Brooklyn, and therefore her errand across the ferry was unnecessary, and so he had finally convinced her, she urging her desire to attend to her old school, in which she had previously been a member, whilst residing in New York. This is what he considered unnecessary travelling.

This speech of Mr. Parker was as interesting as any delivered on the occasion; and after other resolutions were passed of little consequence, and after considerable contention between a few, the Convention brought its busy labors to a close. The number of delegates was seventeen hundred and eleven, the amount collected to aid the better observance of the Sabbath, amounted to forty-two dollars—about eight cents a head. The Hon. Mr. Adams was not present when the collection was taken up.

This numerous Convention, long spoken of, is now over, and will the Sabbath be better observed? Is it by men who have torn in pieces the sacred volume, such mainspring as some notion of the law, and charging all their discords on the Almighty by claiming his authority for their contradictions, is it by such men that we suppose the hearts of the people to observe his holy law? Can they who exhibit such bitter uncharitableness in the pulpit, imagine that their words, because uttered in a Convention, will fall with superior force on the ears of men? We doubt it. The Christian religion does not consist in the Sabbath, or rather the Sunday observance, but in the Sabbath of the heart, and the observance of the Sabbath will no more secure the salvation of the soul, than tee-totalism, unless the ordinances of the Faith preached by the apostles be observed and carried into practice. The observance of the Christian Sabbath is indeed a holy duty; it exalts a nation as well as individuals; let it not be neglected, but Christians, let it be a delight to observance and throw a heavy gloom over the heart, but let it be truly the Lord's day, devoted especially to his worship, but not forgetting that innocent enjoyment which becomes a pious Christian. 'Rejoice, again I say unto you, rejoice,' says the apostle. The joy which he recommends is worthy of the Sabbath day. *Catholic Telegraph.*

PLAIN DEALING.

Gov. Steele, of New-Hampshire, in reply to an address from the people, recommending formal prayer and the use of the Bible in public schools, made by the Rev. Matthew Hale Smith of Nashua, a religious chameleon and adventurer, among other pungent things, says—

I also spoke of other objections which I had to compulsory prayer in schools—that the Bible question was my belief that schools, where vocal prayers were used, were not so well governed as those were without it, and gave my reasons for so believing; and also spoke of the almost inevitable tendency to sectarianism, which that practice led to, and if made an *indispensable* requisite in the teacher, it would inevitably exclude all of the teachers was required to pray against his inclination, it would be little less than *solemn mockery*. It is possible, however, that all prayers should be *optional*, that *all, all, lip-service, all prayers not from the heart, are solemn mockery*. If I did not, I only do it, and will add, that whenever I see even a hypocritical second a public prayer, I see a low-street dandy; his hair and his whiskers, if he has any, jauntingly combed and curled as if he was more intent upon causing the envy of his gay and thoughtless young men around him, or of attracting the attention of the giddy-headed females among his audience, than of serving his Maker. I see a man who is supposed to be in a pulpit dedicated to God, and lift his gloved hand, or jewelled fingers, and with a studied, graceful flourish of his white cambric handkerchief, signify to his audience that he is about to pour forth in measured strains his *lip-service*, I say when I see such a man, in such a place, I have no hesitation in pronouncing him a hypocrite, and his prayers, if prayers they may be called, nothing more nor less than *solemn mockery*.

One word in answer to the Rev. M. Hale Smith's challenge, and I have done. The challenge is to prove *that he ever preached one thing, and believed another*. I believe the challenge, not because there would be any difficulty in the way of his proving clearly that he has *professedly* done so, and that more than once, but because I am firmly of opinion, that among the many doctrines he has preached, he never believed any one of them, and he would, for a good fat salary, as soon preach Mahometanism as any Christian creed. I do not, I believe, as a priest without religion, a man without honor, and an unscrupulous defamer. I judge the tree by the fruit it bears, and not by the wind that whistles through its branches. JNO. H. STEELE.

Peterboro', Jan. 13, 1845.

From the Christian Citizen.

THE METRIOS OF WATERLOO.

The Christian world was represented by the armies that met at the field of Waterloo. We doubt whether a single idolater carried a gun or drew a sword at that battle. It would be fair to assume, that every soldiery there represented believed in the existence of a God, the God of the gospel, the sum and aim of whose infinite attributes are *love*. Yet a warrior-God was invoked to pour out his soul of the day with a brother's blood, who had not heard of the story of Calvary, of redemption and salvation by Jesus Christ, on condition of repentance towards God, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and forgiveness of our enemies; without which, the blood of stonemert could not wash away a single sin, or extend to a single transgressor the pardoning love of Heaven. No pagan standard was unfurled on the morning of that dreadful day. Christian banners alone floated over that horrid scene of human butchery. Protestants, English Churchmen, Lutherans, Greek and Roman Catholics—believers all in the religion of Jesus Christ—mingled, the chief actors in the bloody drama. At the very outset of the deliberations, a truly Protestant scene was acted, exceedingly characteristic of the reformers. A Presbyterian had been appointed to open the Convention 'gratefully recognize the goodness of Jehovah in the appointment of the Sabbath,' but one of the members opposed it on the light of private interpretation, asserting that there was no Sabbath in the New Testament to justify the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, and wishing to amend the resolution by substituting in place of the Sabbath, the words more orthodox in his opinion, 'the Lord's day.' Here was matter for contention! A terrible clamor was made. The chair was called to order, and the *authority* whereby he claimed to preside in the Convention demanded! Some wished to know whether they were to settle the differences between the Papist and Protestant, the Jew and Christian, the Baptist, for if they were required to do so, they might as well adjourn at once. Rev. Mr. Dubin, to calm the agitation of his fellow Protestants, very simply remarked that they had met to adopt measures for the *better* observance of the Sabbath—not to determine which is the Sabbath—thereby intimating that the 'Bible alone was not sufficient proof' on the subject. A Mr. Magruder from Virginia sustained the views of Mr. Lemmon, who gave the first note to this Protestant concert of the Sabbath, and had boldly declared that the Sabbath which Mr. Magruder would introduce, would be of such a character 'as was not to be found on the earth, above the earth, or in the waters that were under the earth.' Mr. Magruder replied, asserting in the course of his remarks, 'that it was an utter *impossibility to keep the Christian Sabbath*!' This was a candid expression of his opinion in the exercise of private judgment of Scripture, which was, of course, intolerable to those Protestants who had no other guide than the Bible. He was interrupted with hisses and cries of order, whilst many persons in the gallery cried, 'turn him out!' Mr. Hammond of Pennsylvania deplored the confusion, and very sensibly observed, 'I remember the tears—he said that he *could* shed tears; but as no one seconded the motion, it does not appear that he did shed them.' Had he had time to do so, he would, no doubt, have been a very interesting spectacle.

The Convention having succeeded in restoring harmony, a very elaborate address was made on steamboats, railroads, and locomotive engines, one of the speakers stating how much his feelings were agonized by hearing 'Engines puffing as it were in the face of heaven, a bold defiance against the God of the Sabbath.' The Rev. Mr. Danforth reprimanded a 'negro for travelling in a steamboat on Sunday! Yes, O! horror of horrors! the negro told him that there was a preacher on board! The question now arose, what was necessary and what was not necessary travelling. The following speech by a Mr. Parker from New-York, will best explain the profound views of the Convention on this subject:

Mr. Parker, of New-York, addressed the Convention on the subject of unnecessary travel on the Sabbath day, illustrating his argument by the case

of a little girl who lived at Brooklyn, but made it a practice to come across the ferry every Sunday morning to New-York, to attend as a member of a Sabbath School. There were plenty of Sabbath Schools in Brooklyn, and therefore her errand across the ferry was unnecessary, and so he had finally convinced her, she urging her desire to attend to her old school, in which she had previously been a member, whilst residing in New York. This is what he considered unnecessary travelling.

This speech of Mr. Parker was as interesting as any delivered on the occasion; and after other resolutions were passed of little consequence, and after considerable contention between a few, the Convention brought its busy labors to a close. The number of delegates was seventeen hundred and eleven, the amount collected to aid the better observance of the Sabbath, amounted to forty-two dollars—about eight cents a head. The Hon. Mr. Adams was not present when the collection was taken up.

This numerous Convention, long spoken of, is now over, and will the Sabbath be better observed? Is it by men who have torn in pieces the sacred volume, such mainspring as some notion of the law, and charging all their discords on the Almighty by claiming his authority for their contradictions, is it by such men that we suppose the hearts of the people to observe his holy law? Can they who exhibit such bitter uncharitableness in the pulpit, imagine that their words, because uttered in a Convention, will fall with superior force on the ears of men? We doubt it. The Christian religion does not consist in the Sabbath, or rather the Sunday observance, but in the Sabbath of the heart, and the observance of the Sabbath will no more secure the salvation of the soul, than tee-totalism, unless the ordinances of the Faith preached by the apostles be observed and carried into practice. The observance of the Christian Sabbath is indeed a holy duty; it exalts a nation as well as individuals; let it not be neglected, but Christians, let it be a delight to observance and throw a heavy gloom over the heart, but let it be truly the Lord's day, devoted especially to his worship, but not forgetting that innocent enjoyment which becomes a pious Christian. 'Rejoice, again I say unto you, rejoice,' says the apostle. The joy which he recommends is worthy of the Sabbath day. *Catholic Telegraph.*

PLAIN DEALING.

Gov. Steele, of New-Hampshire, in reply to an address from the people, recommending formal prayer and the use of the Bible in public schools, made by the Rev. Matthew Hale Smith of Nashua, a religious chameleon and adventurer, among other pungent things, says—

I also spoke of other objections which I had to compulsory prayer in schools—that the Bible question was my belief that schools, where vocal prayers were used, were not so well governed as those were without it, and gave my reasons for so believing; and also spoke of the almost inevitable tendency to sectarianism, which that practice led to, and if made an *indispensable* requisite in the teacher, it would inevitably exclude all of the teachers or was required to pray against his inclination, it would be little less than *solemn mockery*. It is possible, however, that all prayers should be *optional*, that *all, all, lip-service, all prayers not from the heart, ar solemn mockery*. If I did not, I only do it, and will add, that whenever I see even a hypocritical second a public prayer, I see a low-street dandy; his hair and his whiskers, if he has any, jauntingly combed and curled as if he was more intent upon causing the envy of his gay and thoughtless young men around him, or of attracting the attention of the giddy-headed females among his audience, than of serving his Maker. I see a man who is supposed to be in a pulpit dedicated to God, and lift his gloved hand, or jewelled fingers, and with a studied, graceful flourish of his white cambric handkerchief, signify to his audience that he is about to pour forth in measured strains his *lip-service*, I say when I see such a man, in such a place, I have no hesitation in pronouncing him a hypocrite, and his prayers, if prayers they may be called, nothing more nor less than *solemn mockery*.

One word in answer to the Rev. M. Hale Smith's challenge, and I have done. The challenge is to prove *that he ever preached one thing, and believed another*. I believe the challenge, not because there would be any difficulty in the way of his proving clearly that he has *professedly* done so, and that more than once, but because I am firmly of opinion, that among the many doctrines he has preached, he never believed any one of them, and he would, for a good fat salary, as soon preach Mahometanism as any Christian creed. I do not, I believe, as a priest without religion, a man without honor, and an unscrupulous defamer. I judge the tree by the fruit it bears, and not by the wind that whistles through its branches. JNO. H. STEELE.

Peterboro', Jan. 13, 1845.

From the Christian Citizen.

THE METRIOS OF WATERLOO.

The Christian world was represented by the armies that met at the field of Waterloo. We doubt whether a single idolater carried a gun or drew a sword at that battle. It would be fair to assume, that every soldiery there represented believed in the existence of a God, the God of the gospel, the sum and aim of whose infinite attributes are *love*. Yet a warrior-God was invoked to pour out his soul of the day with a brother's blood, who had not heard of the story of Calvary, of redemption and salvation by Jesus Christ, on condition of repentance towards God, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and forgiveness of our enemies; without which, the blood of stonemert could not wash away a single sin, or extend to a single transgressor the pardoning love of Heaven. No pagan standard was unfurled on the morning of that dreadful day. Christian banners alone floated over that horrid scene of human butchery. Protestants, English Churchmen, Lutherans, Greek and Roman Catholics—believers all in the religion of Jesus Christ—mingled, the chief actors in the bloody drama. At the very outset of the deliberations, a truly Protestant scene was acted, exceedingly characteristic of the reformers. A Presbyterian had been appointed to open the Convention 'gratefully recognize the goodness of Jehovah in the appointment of the Sabbath,' but one of the members opposed it on the light of private interpretation, asserting that there was no Sabbath in the New Testament to justify the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, and wishing to amend the resolution by substituting in place of the Sabbath, the words more orthodox in his opinion, 'the Lord's day.' Here was matter for contention! A terrible clamor was made. The chair was called to order, and the *authority* whereby he claimed to preside in the Convention demanded! Some wished to know whether they were to settle the differences between the Papist and Protestant, the Jew and Christian, the Baptist, for if they were required to do so, they might as well adjourn at once. Rev. Mr. Dubin, to calm the agitation of his fellow Protestants, very simply remarked that they had met to adopt measures for the *better* observance of the Sabbath—not to determine which is the Sabbath—thereby intimating that the 'Bible alone was not sufficient proof' on the subject. A Mr. Magruder from Virginia sustained the views of Mr. Lemmon, who gave the first note to this Protestant concert of the Sabbath, and had boldly declared that the Sabbath which Mr. Magruder would introduce, would be of such a character 'as was not to be found on the earth, above the earth, or in the waters that were under the earth.' Mr. Magruder replied, asserting in the course of his remarks, 'that it was an utter *impossibility to keep the Christian Sabbath*!' This was a candid expression of his opinion in the exercise of private judgment of Scripture, which was, of course, intolerable to those Protestants who had no other guide than the Bible. He was interrupted with hisses and cries of order, whilst many persons in the gallery cried, 'turn him out!' Mr. Hammond of Pennsylvania deplored the confusion, and very sensibly observed, 'I remember the tears—he said that he *could* shed tears; but as no one seconded the motion, it does not appear that he did shed them.' Had he had time to do so, he would, no doubt, have been a very interesting spectacle.

The Convention having succeeded in restoring harmony, a very elaborate address was made on steamboats, railroads, and locomotive engines, one of the speakers stating how much his feelings were agonized by hearing 'Engines puffing as it were in the face of heaven, a bold defiance against the God of the Sabbath.' The Rev. Mr. Danforth reprimanded a 'negro for travelling in a steamboat on Sunday! Yes, O! horror of horrors! the negro told him that there was a preacher on board! The question now arose, what was necessary and what was not necessary travelling. The following speech by a Mr. Parker from New-York, will best explain the profound views of the Convention on this subject:

Mr. Parker, of New-York, addressed the Convention on the subject of unnecessary travel on the Sabbath day, illustrating his argument by the case

of a little girl who lived at Brooklyn, but made it a practice to come across the ferry every Sunday morning to New-York, to attend as a member of a Sabbath School. There were plenty of Sabbath Schools in Brooklyn, and therefore her errand across the ferry was unnecessary, and so he had finally convinced her, she urging her desire to attend to her old school, in which she had previously been a member, whilst residing in New York. This is what he considered unnecessary travelling.

This speech of Mr. Parker was as interesting as any delivered on the occasion; and after other resolutions were passed of little consequence, and after considerable contention between a few, the Convention brought its busy labors to a close. The number of delegates was seventeen hundred and eleven, the amount collected to aid the better observance of the Sabbath, amounted to forty-two dollars—about eight cents a head. The Hon. Mr. Adams was not present when the collection was taken up.

This numerous Convention, long spoken of, is now over, and will the Sabbath be better observed? Is it by men who have torn in pieces the sacred volume, such mainspring as some notion of the law, and charging all their discords on the Almighty by claiming his authority for their contradictions, is it by such men that we suppose the hearts of the people to observe his holy law? Can they who exhibit such bitter uncharitableness in the pulpit, imagine that their words, because uttered in a Convention, will fall with superior force on the ears of men? We doubt it. The Christian religion does not consist in the Sabbath, or rather the Sunday observance, but in the Sabbath of the heart, and the observance of the Sabbath will no more secure the salvation of the soul, than tee-totalism, unless the ordinances of the Faith preached by the apostles be observed and carried into practice. The observance of the Christian Sabbath is indeed a holy duty; it exalts a nation as well as individuals; let it not be neglected, but Christians, let it be a delight to observance and throw a heavy gloom over the heart, but let it be truly the Lord's day, devoted especially to his worship, but not forgetting that innocent enjoyment which becomes a pious Christian. 'Rejoice, again I say unto you, rejoice,' says the apostle. The joy which he recommends is worthy of the Sabbath day. *Catholic Telegraph.*

PLAIN DEALING.

Gov. Steele, of New-Hampshire, in reply to an address from the people, recommending formal prayer and the use of the Bible in public schools, made by the Rev. Matthew Hale Smith of Nashua, a religious chameleon and adventurer, among other pungent things, says—

I also spoke of other objections which I had to compulsory prayer in schools—that the Bible question was my belief that schools, where vocal prayers were used, were not so well governed as those were without it, and gave my reasons for so believing; and also spoke of the almost inevitable tendency to sectarianism, which that practice led to, and if made an *indispensable* requisite in the teacher, it would inevitably exclude all of the teachers or was required to pray against his inclination, it would be little less that *solemn mockery*. It is possible, however, that all prayers should be *optional*, that *all, all, lip-service, all prayers not from the heart, ar solemn mockery*. If I did not, I only do it, and will add, that whenever I see even a hypocritical second a public prayer, I see a low-street dandy; his hair and his whiskers, if he has any, jauntingly combed and curled as if he was more intent upon causing the envy of his gay and thoughtless young men around him, or of attracting the attention of the giddy-headed females among his audience, than of serving his Maker. I see a man who is supposed to be in a pulpit dedicated to God, and lift his gloved hand, or jewelled fingers, and with a studied, graceful flourish of his white cambric handkerchief, signify to his audience that he is about to pour forth in measured strains his *lip-service*, I say when I see such a man, in such a place, I have no hesitation in pronouncing him a hypocrite, and his prayers, if prayers they may be called, nothing more nor less than *solemn mockery*.

One word in answer to the Rev. M. Hale Smith's challenge, and I have done. The challenge is to prove *that he ever preached one thing, and believed another*. I believe the challenge, not because there would be any difficulty in the way of his proving clearly that he has *professedly* done so, and that more than once, but because I am firmly of opinion, that among the many doctrines he has preached, he never believed any one of them, and he would, for a good fat salary, as soon preach Mahometanism as any Christian creed. I do not, I believe, as a priest without religion, a man without honor, and an unscrupulous defamer. I judge the tree by the fruit it bears, and not by the wind that whistles through its branches. JNO. H. STEELE.

Peterboro', Jan. 13, 1845.

☞ The Christian Citizen, though from a Catholic source, contains some very just animadversions.

NATIONAL SABBATH CONVENTION.

This heterogeneous assembly from various States in the East and South, met in Baltimore on the 27th of November, and has been engaged in some form for the stricter observance of the Sabbath. Whether the proceedings will have much effect on the nation is matter of doubt, and whether during its session much bad feeling was exhibited, is quite certain, as the notes of the Reporters very clearly prove. The Hon. John Quincy Adams presided, and on the Committee of Arrangements, was appointed '*the* Sabbath' not the Sabbath *indefinitely*, that it was invulnerable. As a general rule, he always obeyed the commands of God and the Commandments of the blessed day, but as to the diversity of opinion which existed relative to the mode of its observance, he had not paid sufficient attention to enable him to view the question in its bearing.' At the very outset of the deliberations, a truly Protestant scene was acted, exceedingly characteristic of the reformers. A Presbyterian had been appointed to open the Convention 'gratefully recognize the goodness of Jehovah in the appointment of the Sabbath,' but one of the members opposed it on the light of private interpretation, asserting that there was no Sabbath in the New Testament to justify the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, and wishing to amend the resolution by substituting in place of the Sabbath, the words more orthodox in his opinion, 'the Lord's day.' Here was matter for contention! A terrible clamor was made. The chair was called to order, and the *authority* whereby he claimed to preside in the Convention demanded! Some wished to know whether they were to settle the differences between the Papist and Protestant, the Jew and Christian, the Baptist, for if they were required to do so, they might as well adjourn at once. Rev. Mr. Dubin, to calm the agitation of his fellow Protestants, very simply remarked that they had met to adopt measures for the *better* observance of the Sabbath—not to determine which is the Sabbath—thereby intimating that the