National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. Without Concealment....Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. XI....NO. 9. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1850. WHOLE NO. 529.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

Norris & Brother, Printers.

CELEBRATION AT ABINGTON,

JULY 4, 1850.

At the time appointed, a long train of cars left the Old Colony Depot for the beautiful pine grove, at Abington, receiving frequent accessions along the line of railroad. The morning was gloomily threatening, and, for some days previous, the weather had been unsettled—undoubtedly detaining many more at home, who, in spirit, were with us on that occasion. But before the meeting had very far advanced, the clouds broke away, and the sun shone out gloriously, adding brilliancy and effect to the interesting and exciting scene—sparkling upon the bright waves of the beautiful little lake, on the shores of which the grove is situated, lighting up all faces with gladness, and giving assurance that the proceedings of the day would not be rendered memorable by the disagreeable appendage of a dripping garment.

The Chair was taken at 11 o'clock, by Francis Jackson, Esq., of Boston. A committee to nominate officers was then chosen, who nominated the following gentlemen:—

For President — WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

For Vice-Presidents—Francis Jackson, of Boston; Bourne Spooner, of Plymouth; Edmund Quincy, of Dedham; Samuel Dyer, of Abington; Edward E. Bennett, of N. Bridgewater; Elias Richards, of Weymouth.

For Secretaries—Samuel May, Jr., of Boston; John Dick, of Rochester, N. Y.

For Finance Committee—Joshua T. Everett, of Princeton; Lewis Ford, of Abington; Nathaniel B. Spooner, of Plymouth; Elbridge Sprague, of Abington; John H Crane, of Blackstone; Austin Bearse, of Barnstable.

These nominations were put to vote, and accepted by the meeting.

Mr. Garrison then read passages from one of the prophets, singularly applicable to the present condition and character of the American people. One of the songs selected for the day was then sung, giving to the breeze, on Independence Day, the fitting, but unusual sounds of deliverance to the captive, and hope to the oppressed.

Having called Francis Jackson to the Chair, Mr. Garrison read the following resolution, and proceeded to address the meeting in its support:—

Resolved, That the most revolting spectacle of wickedness, the most astounding exhibition of hypocrisy, ever witnessed, is seen this day on the part of our nation, which, while proclaiming it to be a self evident truth that all men are created equal, and endowed with an inalienable right to liberty, is holding in the galling fetters of chattel Slavery three millions of its inhabitants; and which while celebrating its seventy-fifth jubilee in honor of those who achieved its independence, is covering with reproach and denying protection to those who are peacefully laboring for the overthrow of a bondage, 'one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which our fathers rose in rebellion to oppose.'

Mr. Garrison began by remarking, that for whatever of personal, religious or civil liberty we this day enjoy, let us give thanks to God, and remember with gratitude the sacrifices and struggles of those who dared to grapple with oppression, that they and their posterity might be free. It was something—it was much—to be living under a government in which neither sedition nor rebellion is recognized even in the strongest denunciations against it—in the freest utterance of sentiments hostile to its existence. By the Constitution of the United States—objectionable as that instrument is on many grounds—freedom of speech is secured to any extent in opposition to the laws of the land, and to the entire modification or subversion of the Constitution itself. Treason cannot be committed by the tongue: it is not to be found in words, however inflammatory, but in deeds—in deeds clearly defined. It is an overt act—either taking up arms to resist the government, or giving aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war, by furnishing him with information or supplies. Not a government in the Old World is free or popular enough to grant any such indulgence—not even that of France, though in form a republic.

In the free States, the Constitution of the country, in this particular, has ever been duly honored so far as local legislation is concerned. In none of them in a law to be found, abridging freedom of speech or of the press, touching any institution or custom. Hence the numerous riots that have disgraced the North, to put an end to free discussion, and to overawe the advocates of unpalatable doctrines. Those who feel that they cannot meet the arguments of the Abolitionists with arguments, that they are on the wrong side, have frequently become furiously excited, and endeavored to create a riot—conscious that they could not call upon the governments to destroy what they so much dreaded, for the time being,—freedom of debate.

In the slaveholding States, the case is very different. There, the Slave Power exercises complete sovereignty over the Constitution, and nullifies its provisions *ad libitum*. There, freedom of speech and of the press is not tolerated any more than it is in Austria or Russia—and essentially for the same reason. There, language is declared to be seditious; and for uttering certain sentiments, or printing or circulating certain publications, the offender is in peril of his life.

Seventy-four years have fled since the Declaration of Independence was made to the world. During that period, we have grown immensely in population, in wealth, in military and naval power. From thirteen, we have multiplied to thirty States; from three millions to more than twenty millions. Our domains are extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In commerce, in the arts and sciences, in enterprise and power, we have advanced beyond historical precedent.

But what has been our growth, during the same period, in virtue, in true piety, in a generous love of impartial liberty? For, if, in these particulars, we have grown more and more degenerate, then we are all the more swiftly ripening for destruction,—then commerce, wealth, population, extent of territory, will only serve as additional fuel to consume us.

A single statement will give a comprehensive reply to this inquiry.

We began with six slaveholding States, and have now fifteen—with five hundred thousand slaves, and have now more than three millions!

Mr. Garrison said he would proceed to contrast the spirit of liberty as it existed in the days of our revolutionary fathers, with the sentiments which are now unblushingly maintained in relation to human enslavement, in one half of the American Union. For this purpose, he read the following poem, which appeared in the *New England Chronicle*, published in Cambridge on the 18th of April, 1775, the day before the battle at Lexington:

TO THE AMERICANS.

THE DAY BEFORE THE BATTLE.

Ye Heirs of Freedom! glorious is your Cause;
Your ALL, your charter'd Liberty and Laws,
Are now at Stake—then let the noble Fires
Which warm'd the bosoms of your godlike Sires,
Now fill your Souls with an heroic Flame,
To shield your Rights and gain immortal fame!
Great Liberty! inspire each freeborn mind
With Ardor in THE CAUSE of *human kind*,
The Cause of Heaven, the great Concern of Earth—
The Cause of all who ever shall have birth,
From this bright Hour through Ages as they roll,
Who live from the World's Center to the Pole.
Americans! let man to man be join'd
In Freedom's Cause, the Courage steel each mind
To meet the Tyrants, and their hostile Band
Drive from the crimson'd Field—and sweep the Land
Of every wretch, who hath his country sold
For empty Honor, or for sordid Gold,
Who would destroy the Freedom of the brave,
That HIS MEAN SELF might live a pensioned Slave
Death, drest in Horror, meets the guilty Great,
And makes them tremble on the Throne of State;
Not so the brave, the just, the good and wise,
Death is their passport to the blissful Skies
April 18, 1775.

This, then, was the spirit of '75. The struggle then commencing was regarded as 'the cause of all who ever shall have birth,' not merely in this country, but of those 'who live from the world's centre to the pole.' Now it is unblushingly maintained, that the extension and perpetuity of chattel Slavery was among the great purposes of the revolutionary conflict!

To show how incompatible slaveholding was deemed at that time with the principles of the Declaration of Independence, by individual slaveholders, Mr. Garrison related an anecdote of Dr. Moses Bloomfield, an eminent physician of New Jersey, who, at the termination of the war, made all haste to emancipate his slaves. The day selected for their liberation was July 4th, 1783:

'The public meeting took place in the township of Woodbridge. Great preparations had been made; an ox was roasted, and large numbers assembled to partake of it, and to listen to the orator of the day, Dr. Bloomfield, father of the late Governor Bloomfield, of New Jersey. At the appointed time, the orator mounted the platform, followed by all his slaves, fourteen in number, seven of whom took places on his left and seven on his right, while he addressed the multitude on the evils of Slavery. At the close of his speech, he turned to his slaves, stating, that inasmuch as we, as a nation, had declared all men equal, he could not, consistently, hold slaves. Why, he asked, should these my fellow citizens be held in bondage? From this day they are free!

'In the midst of the applause which followed, the Doctor called up to him one somewhat advanced in years. 'Hector,' said he, 'when you cannot support yourself, you are entitled to a maintenance from my property. When do you suppose you will need that maintenance?'

'The delighted negro held up his left hand, and with his right drew a line across the middle joint of his fingers. 'Neber, massa, never, so long as any of dese fingers are left above dese joints'

'*There*, fellow citizens,' said the Doctor, 'you see that liberty is as dear to the man of color as to you or me.''

Would to Heaven, (said Mr. Garrison,) that the bosom of every living slaveholder in this country might be inspired this day with the same redeeming spirit; so that, ere the setting of the sun, not a slave might be left to clank his fetters on the American soil, and all might join in one universal shout of thanksgiving and praise! But what are the sentiments now avowed, even in the high places of power—the Capitol of the republic?

In the course of a speech delivered a few days since in Congress, Mr Brown of Mississippi said—'You may think Slavery an evil. Very well, think so; but *keep your thoughts to yourselves*.' A most gracious permission, and a most reasonable requirement! 'You may think my reign an evil,' says the Russian Autocrat to his Polish victims; 'very well, think so; but *keep your thoughts to yourselves*.' The language and the dictation of tyrants are the same the world over. It is a great boon that our fathers secured to us by their blood, that we are to keep our thoughts to ourselves, especially on the last subject under heaven to be allowed to go undiscussed!

Mr. Wellborn, of Georgia, in a recent speech in the United States House of Representatives, coolly declared—'The dogma that ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL, is a mystical postulate.' And so our fathers waged a seven years' war against Great Britain to establish 'a mystical postulate'! All that they bequeathed to us was 'a mystical postulate'! All that we now enjoy, in consequence of their heroic deeds, is 'a mystical postulate'! And this is the progress we are making in the cause of universal freedom!

To illustrate the murderous spirit which prevails at the South, Mr. Garrison read extracts from sundry newspapers printed in that section of the country, in which it was declared, that any individual who dared to circulate Anti-Slavery tracts or newspapers among them was 'justly worthy, in the sight of God and man, of immediate death'—that 'the gallows and the stake await the Abolitionists who shall dare to appear in person among us'—that 'the very moment any private individual attempts to lecture us on the evils and immorality of Slavery, and the necessity of putting means in operation to secure us from them, in the same moment his tongue shall be cut out, and cast upon the dunghill'—that 'the cry of the whole South should be death, instant death to the Abolitionist, wherever he is caught'—that 'lashes will not herenfter be spared the backs of Northern emissaries,' caught at the South; 'they will never return to tell their sufferings, but they shall expiate the crime of interfering with our domestic institutions, by being BURNED AT THE STAKE'

Referring to the recent speech made at Charlestown, by the Hon. Edward Everett, on the anniversary of the battle of Bunker Hill, Mr. Garrison said that, in the printing of it, there was one sentiment omitted, whether by accident or design he could not say,—but, certainly, not a very startling or heretical sentiment to be uttered before such an audience, on such an occasion. It was this:—'The blood of kings, queens and nobility is not better than the blood of the people.' Now, it was very easy, very safe, for Edward Everett to utter that opinion on this side of the Atlantic. He knew—the merest truism that it is—before declaring it, that it would be (as it was) loudly applauded. But, respected popular and eloquent as he is—surrounded as he is by troops of admiring and influential friends—if he would know precisely what are his rights under the Constitution, and test the value of the Union, let him go to the South, if he dare, (and he might take Daniel Webster with him, if he could get him,) and there proclaim—'The blood of the haughtiest planter is no better than that of the meanest slave'—and he would quickly discover that his safety depended upon the suddenness of his flight. Liberty and equality are not to be preached at the South, irrespective of the color of the skin, except on peril of martyrdom. 'To this *complexion* it has come at last.'

Mr. Garrison here read several extracts from Southern Journals, defending Slavery as an institution divine in its origin, beneficent in its operations, and worthy of vast extension!!! A single specimen from the *Augusta* (Ga.) *Republic* must here suffice:—

'We invite any, who are not blinded to madness, to look into this holy, wise and merciful work of the beneficent Creator. And in defending the character of the Christian's God, as the author of Southern Slavery, we only ask that its history may be traced. . . . Nor is the wisdom and mercy of God less marked with infinite benevolence, in allowing these captive sons of Canaan to be transported from bondage in their own land of degradation and darkness, to our country, where their enlightenment and religious opportunities would not only elevate their civil character, but secure to them gospel privileges, through which thousands of them have rejoiced in past ages, and thousands will rejoice in redeeming mercy, in every generation, down to the judgment trump. . . . God has greatly improved the condition of Joseph, by providentially causing him to be thrown into our honest possession, and as the steward of such a trust, we feel bound to take good care of our charge; and God forbid that the vandalism of Yankee and British fanaticism should bring against us any iniquitous Pharaoh to wield the sceptre of oppression over them, and in after generations.'

Again:—

'Our slaves are greatly prospering, and the God of heaven has placed not only New, but Old Mexico, in such geographical and climatical juxtaposition to our sunny South, that I know not but when enlargement for our slaves may require. He who ever favored those walking under the banner of truth and righteousness, may open the way in peace and good will too, for his peculiar institution of Slavery, to carry its blessings still farther West.

Ah, why, we ask, should it not be destined to pass over the battle-fields of Mexico to the Halls of the Montezumas, bearing thither this glorious gospel banner, whose motto is glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and good will toward man? There not only to give to all classes access to the true religion, to raise the poor Peon to an equality with our slaves in point of religious privileges, but to unshackle his mind fettered in superstition, and elevate him as a descendant of Japheth, to a position in the scale of intellectuality far above the point beyond which the sons of Canaan can ever rise, with God's prophetic doom stamped upon their physical and intellectual organs.'

Where can impudence and impiety be found equal to this? Men-stealers and traffickers in human flesh boasting of their 'walking under the banner of truth and righteousness,' and lustily shouting while advocating eternal Slavery, 'Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and good will toward men!!

But why dwell upon Southern devotion to their infernal slave system, and rabid hostility to the Anti-Slavery agitation? Has not Daniel Webster had the audacity to stand before the citizens of Boston, within a brief period, and declare—'The *discussion* of the subject of Slavery, *in Congress and out of it*, MUST BE SUPPRESSED?' Yes, our lips must be padlocked, our hearts unmoved, though we see millions of our countrymen tasked, scourged, manacled, and sold in the market with cattle and swine! *We* must not, our *representatives* must not be allowed to discuss the question, whether it is right to rob the mother of her babe, the husband of his wife, a larger population than fills New England of the marriage institution, and all hope of deliverance from their unmitigated bondage! Such a discussion is detrimental to the business, prosperity and tranquility of the nation!!!

So much for the Northern 'Defender of the Constitution.' How is it with the Northern Champions of the Church? Bishop Hedding says he finds the slaveholding relation in the Golden Rule—'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them!' Professor Stuart (the theological bottle-holder of Mr. Webster) says he finds it in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue! And he roundly denies that the passages of Scripture, so often cited by the 'infidel' Abolitionists in condemnation of American Slavery, such as 'Undo the heavy burden, break *every* yoke, let the oppressed go free, hide the outcast, bewray not him that wandereth, deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor,' &c. &c.—have anything to do with the question! Hear what he says:—

'Of all the prophetic texts, I believe Is. 58: 6 has been the subject of appeal most frequent, and confident too. What says it? 'Loose the bands of wickedness; undo the heavy burdens; let the oppressed go free; break every yoke' The prophet further enjoins, that they shall give bread to the hungry, house-shelter to poor wanderers, and clothing to the naked. He then adds: '*Hide not thyself from thine own flesh.*' And who then are they that are thus described? Plainly *fellow-countrymen, citizens of the same commonwealth and kindred by blood.* Let the reader, if he doubts this interpretation of the expression *one's own flesh*, open his Bible at Gen 29: 14 and 2 Sam. 5: 1. 19: 13, 14 Judg 9: 2. It is clearly the oppressed and degraded *Hebrews*, then, of whom the prophet is speaking in this whole passage. It has no special relation to slaves at all, whether heathen or Jewish. Surely heathen slaves would not be called, by Isaiah, the 'own flesh' of the Hebrews. Yet this passage is printed in staring capitals every day, as the sentence of an ultimate and supreme tribunal, which decides the cause of the Abolitionists in their favor.

The next appeal is to Jer. 34: 17. 'Ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty, every one [illegible] The context (vs. 12—16) informs us, that the Jews of that day paid no regard to the liberation of Hebrew slaves, when the seventh or liberty year had come. The masters still continued their bondage. Jeremiah threatens them, therefore, with divine judgments, on account of their perfidy to the law of Moses. But—not a word or syllable is here, about the bondage of *heathen* slaves

Another appeal is to Isa. 16: 3 'Hide the outcasts; bewray not him that wandereth.' And who are the *outcasts* and the *wanderer?* They are the fugitive daughters of Moab, who flee from the conquering invaders of their country, and seek safety in the land of Israel. The prophet presents them as addressing the Hebrew people, beseeching them, in the words quoted, to conceal them in a place of safety, and not to tell the pursuing enemy where they are, i. e. not to bewray them. This is all. But how this is to be put to the justification of concealing runaway slaves, or made into a command to aid and protect them, I have not sagacity enough to divine'

This is rare ethical reasoning. In their dealings with each other, it seems, the Jews were required by God to be just and merciful, to recognize each other as of one flesh, and to break every yoke; but, as to the rest of mankind, they might scorn, outrage and enslave them with impunity! The moral obligations which were laid upon them to walk uprightly related only to themselves, and had no binding force in their dealings with other nations! Hence, it is both the moral and constitutional duty of the free States to catch all fugitive slaves among them, and to restore them to their *Christian* countrymen at the South! Contrast all this with the language of the amiable and tender-hearted Cowper—language taught us from our childhood as worthy of everlasting remembrance:—

'I would not have a slave to till my ground,
To carry me, to fan me while I sleep,
And tremble when I wake, for all the wealth
That sinews, bought and sold, have ever earned.
No—dear as freedom is, and in my heart's
Just estimation prised above all price,
I had much rather be myself the slave,
And wear the bonds, than fasten them on him.'

Mr. Garrison concluded his remarks by reading Whittier's last poetical effusion, 'A Sabbath Scene,' describing in the most graphic manner the seizure of a female slave (in imagination) at the very horns of the altar!

'I woke; and, lo! the fitting cause
Of all my dream's vagaries—
Two bulky pamphlets, *Webster's text*
With Stuart's commentaries!'

At the close of his speech, Mr. Garrison introduced to the meeting a noble stalwart representative of our colored brethren who gave his name as John Allen, (not his real name,) very recently from the South, by the underground railway. This fugitive from bondage gave an interesting account of the mode of his escape, and the particular act of oppression which led him to make the attempt. His chief object, at present, he stated to be, to raise money enough to purchase his sister, who had been sold to the slave-dealer, and sent to New Orleans for the very heinous crime of praying with her fellow-slaves, and reading the Bible for their religious edification!

Edmund Quincy, of Dedham, was then called to the stand, and made a short but very effective speech, denunciatory of the hypocrisy of the American people. He ridiculed the *military (!)* of Boston; said that, to be consistent with their own ideas of war, and of military glory and State rights, instead of doing escort duty to a civic procession and school *children*, and firing away their powder into waste smoke, on this day, their booming cannon should be belching forth iron hail, and sleet, and balls of fire, upon Charleston and New Orleans, in vindication of the insulted honor of Massachusetts. It is ridiculous that the insignificant little State of South Carolina, which any one of our counties could whip, should be permitted to tread upon the rights of her sisters and co-equal States.

Our citizens are this day celebrating the seventy-fifth anniversary of the day on which the Fathers of the revolution declared the Independence of these States. Of what use has that Declaration of Independence been to this country? Prior to that day, it was ruled by the lords of the soil, who at least had the prestige of historical fame, and the great and warlike deeds of their forefathers, to give them some shadow of right to rule. Ever since that day, as every one knows, these States have been ruled by the miserable lords of the lash—a poor exchange! Were the day of final doom to come now—the belief of the Millerites to be verified, and the curtain of the world's history to drop here,—it were better that the Declaration of Independence had never been made.

At the close of Mr. Quincy's address, the meeting broke up for an hour, to give time to take some refreshment. The various tents were soon occupied, and knots of friends were seated under the cool shade of the trees, partaking of the good things that had been provided.

AFTERNOON, 2 O'CLOCK.

The meeting was again called to order by the Chairman, who introduced to the assembly a remarkable colored woman, formerly a slave, well known by the name of Sojourner Truth. In her own peculiar and impressive style and dialect, she showed the wickedness of selling the child from its parents. 'Do not white women,' said she, love their infants?' Are not we colored women human? Have we not human feelings? We are human, and we suffer as much when our little ones are torn from us, as you white mothers do. The Chairman recommended a general purchase of her Narrative, in pamphlet form, and many copies were readily bought.

Samuel May, Jr. read a letter from Frederick Douglass, in reply to an invitation to be present on this occasion.

Mr. Garrison then made a short speech, illustrative of the demoniac spirit of Slavery, and read, as proof the following notice to shipmasters, posted within a few months in the port of Wilmington, (N. C.):

NOTICE.

TO MASTERS OF VESSELS.

The undersigned, Harbor Master for the Port of Wilmington, holds himself in readiness to attend to the smoking of all vessels bound for Northern ports. The frequency of the secretion or abduction of Slaves has become so common, that more than ordinary vigilance should be exercised. All Masters of vessels, who wish to leave this port free from imputation, would do well to call on the Harbor Master.

JNO. S. JAMES, H. M.

N. B.—The penalty of the law is *death*. (!!!)
Dec. 11th, 1849.

The object of this smoking was to discover whether any runaway slaves were on board the vessel, and either to drive them from their hiding-places or suffocate them.

Wendell Phillips followed in a speech of great force and eloquence. [A sketch of this speech we hope to be able to publish in our next number.]

Rev. Claudius Bradford, of Bridgewater, next took the stand. He read an extract from a letter of J. T. Everett, in a recent *Liberator*, which relates an incident at the late N. E. Anti-Slavery Convention, between a reverend clergyman of the city and a reporter for one of the daily newspapers. Mr. Bradford spoke of it as a very apt illustration of the influence of the pulpit, and of its unfaithfulness and neglect in regard to the Anti-Slavery cause. He recognized the fact that there were exceptions to this unfaithfulness, but he declared it to be true of the most of them. And he went on to declare that, at this day, the truest church, according to the idea of Jesus and the New Testament, is to be found amongst those whom a vast majority of the pulpits and so called religious presses are denouncing as *infidels!* These infidels,—so called because they expose and rebuke the neglect and sin of the churches,—have observed, said Mr. B., the Christian commands to do unto others as we would wish to be done by, to love our brother as ourselves, and to feed and protect and rescue the suffering man, far more truly and devotedly than the great body of the Church. Our Anti-Slavery friends are sometimes charged with not making the proper exceptions [illegible] faithfulness to duty; but, sir, said Mr B., I hold it to be for us, who are ministers, *to make the exceptions*, in our own practice, and if we do not, then to receive the deserved rebuke.

The President called upon Nathaniel H. Whiting, of Marshfield, to take the platform, as one far more worthy of respect than the Marshfield Senator at Washington. (Applause.)

Mr. Whiting, on coming forward, said he felt embarrassed by such an introduction to the audience.

The President said he would explain. Daniel Webster is not an honest man—our friend Whiting is—and the poet has assured us that

'An honest man's the noblest work of God!'

Therefore our friend Whiting is a better and a greater man than Daniel Webster. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. Whiting, after remarking that he was a laboring man, daily compelled to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, and therefore having no time to cull the flowers of rhetoric, or to prepare a classical and eloquent speech, even if he had the ability, proceeded to speak with hope and confidence of the coming triumph, if Abolitionists would only be true to their principles, and bold to avow them. Moses Stuart says that Slavery is recognized by the Bible. He is welcome to his opinion on that subject. But we need not go to Moses Stuart, or inquire whether or no it is our duty to return fugitive slaves, or whether Paul sent back Onesimus as a slave. We are greater than Paul; inasmuch as we are living, and Paul is dead. When we look at the fugitives on this platform, we need not inquire what Moses Stuart says on the subject. We see, without any mist from Moses Stuart's commentaries that these are independent, thinking and acting human beings, as we ourselves are. It is for each one to speak out his own sentiments, in regard to this slave-catching business, without regard to mere authority.

Mr. Whiting dwelt on the importance of every one doing his own thinking, and acting according to his highest convictions, independently and boldly. Oppression in every form, and in all lands, is to be confronted and overthrown, and the down-trodden masses of mankind elevated to equal rights and privileges.

The Chairman said—Our friend who has just taken his seat thinks that every man ought to make his voice heard at the present time, especially in regard to the seizure of the panting fugitive. Let us see what we can do on this occasion I do not know whether we can make Moses Stuart at Andover, and Daniel Webster at Washington, hear us, but I think we can, if we do our best. As many of you, therefore, as are resolved—God helping you—that, henceforth, Massachusetts shall be free soil, and that, Constitution or no Constitution, law or no law, every fugitive slave on touching it shall find shelter and protection, will manifest it by saying, *Aye!*

A mighty shout went up to heaven from the crowded assembly, and made the welkin ring.

The chairman now called for the negative side, but the stillness of death was the only answer!

Wm. I. Bowditch, of Brookline, made some brief but exceedingly pertinent remarks. Abolitionists' he said, are accused of *infidelity*. I accept the charge. I am an infidel to American religion,—to the religion of those men who invest the funds of Theological Schools and Missionary Societies in slaves, and who sell those slaves again when they want to raise money to promote their *religious (!)* ends. We are not infidel to the religion which succors and relieves the poor and needy; but we believe in no religion, let it be called by what name it may, that countenances or gives any shelter to slaveholding. It requires no theology to convince me that slaveholding is a sin; and every system of religion that defends that sin, I denounce as a false religion. We are accused, too, of being *traitors*. Traitors to what? According to the United States Constitution, there can be no treason without action. The treason of the Abolitionist is this—that we renounce all allegiance to a government based on the right of property in man; and so, by the help of God, we will continue to do.

Ichabod Morton, of Plymouth, made a humorous speech, exposing the fallacy of the arguments used by slaveholding politicians and churches in defence of Slavery, and spoke pointedly in reprobation of the pro-slavery course of Daniel Webster, whose residence (he thought) ought no longer to be in Plymouth county, but South of Mason and Dixon's line.

The exercises of the day were concluded by the whole assembly singing, to the tune of 'Away the bowl,' the following song:

COME ALL WHO CLAIM THE FREEMAN'S NAME.

I.

Come all who claim the freeman's name,
Come join in earnest song;
In Freedom's praise your voices raise,
And loud the strain prolong.
Ring out the shout, the land throughout—
No room be here for craven doubt?
In trust arouse, with truthful vows,
Arouse! arouse! arouse!

II.

From 'British yoke and galling chain,'
Our fathers loosed the land;
But other yokes and bonds remain,
Their sons with shame to brand:
For chains and bars, and whips and scars,
Now mingle with Columbia's stars,
To change for shame her banner's fame—
For shame! for shame! for shame!

III.

Sons of the free! shall these things be
Where th' eagle's scream is heard?
Beneath a sky where gleams the eye
Of Freedom's mountain bird?
Shall former emblems only be
The epitaphs of Liberty?
Then thunder, 'No!'—Let th' outcry go,
'Oh no! oh no! oh no!'

IV.

While justice, honor, mercy, love,
Are aught but empty sounds,
We'll strive foul Slavery's curse to drive
Beyond our nation's bounds,
For right we'll fight, with all our might,
While truth sheds down her full clear light;
'LET ALL BE FREE!' the cry shall be—
'Be free! be free! be free!'

V.

On this fair land let Freedom stand,
And wide her banner wave;
Nor ever be our blood-bought soil
Her hapless, hopeless grave!
While beams the star that shows the North,
While bondmen dream of Freedom's worth,
They'll flee away, at rest to stay,
Away! away! away!

VI.

O God of love! look from above
In mercy on the Slave!
Let blessed peace bring his release—
Let truth be strong to save!
When comes the day, as come it must,
That chains shall crumble into dust,
We'll all hurrah, both near and far,
Hurrah! hurrah! hurrah!

Special thanks are due to the Selectmen of Abington for giving their personal attendance without request, and preventing any annoyance being given to the meeting by the thoughtlessness of boys in exploding fire-crackers, &c., in juvenile 'honor of the day.'

During the day, the South Abington Brass Band performed a variety of stirring airs in a creditable manner, and, in addition to the regular collection, a contribution was voluntarily made in their behalf, amounting to something more than twenty dollars.

The chairman proposed three cheers for universal liberty, which were most heartily given, when the meeting adjourned *sine die*.

W. L GARRISON, *President*.

John Dick,
Samuel May, Jr. } *Secretaries*.

THE INDICTMENT AGAINST SAMUEL M. JANNEY.

Our readers, generally are doubtless aware of the fact that Samuel M. Janney, of Loudoun county, Va., was indicted last year in that State, for publishing a series of Anti-Slavery articles in a paper called the Washingtonian, published in Leesburg. These articles formed a review of a discourse spoken in the town of Leesburg, by the Rev. Doctor William A. Smith, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Some of the religious brethren of the Doctor, who, like himself, believe in the divinity of negro Slavery, were greatly incensed against Mr. Janney, not only because he stated that that great disciple of the bond-breaking Jesus was very dim in his apprehension of scripture, but because he tore the flimsey web of the Reverend gentleman's argument into tatters. They therefore brought the case before the Grand Jury, and that enlightened body found a true bill against Mr. Janney. He was indicted for a penitentiary offence, and had the exemplary Christians who instituted these proceedings against him, succeeded in their gentle designs, Mr. Janney would have been subjected to a heavy pecuniary fine, and to one or more years confinement in the state penitentiary—his family would have been deprived of a husband and father, and the community of one of the best men it contains. Yes—it was the design of the Christian men who proceeded against Mr. Janney, to accomplish all that we have said, because he, in the exercise of a heaven-born right, the use of which is secured to each individual in the constitution of Virginia, as well as the constitution of every other state in the confederacy, saw fit to make a temperate reply to a public discourse delivered by a man who, in the garb of a gospel minister, travels about as a missionary, promulgating what he doubtless thinks sound Christian views but which are, in truth, vile calumnies on the character of Christ and of the teachings of his apostles.

We call this an age of reason and of knowledge, and we boast that our country is the freest and most enlightened country on the face of the globe; and yet, in the centre of this country, one of its best men is threatened with fine and imprisonment, because in the country of his birth, he publishes a review of a straggling defence of the atrocious system of negro Slavery uttered by a stranger. And worse than all, the men, who essayed to fine and imprison this good man, profess to be the followers of Jesus Christ. Doubtless they make very sorrowing prayers, and have the trick of rolling up the white of the eye and lengthening out their visage to the orthodox standard of godliness, as on each Sunday they are attacked with that sort of piety which, like the fever and ague, is periodical, and growing excessively fervent, they pray for the prevalence of heavenly charity and the spirit of peace. We do not know the name of any one of these ecstatic Christians who strove to punish Mr. Janney for exploding Doctor Smith's slanders on scripture and common sense, but we do not believe that there is one of them who is not more distinguished for his folly, fanaticism, or hypocrisy, than he is by Christian knowledge, sound patriotism, or by common sense.

No good patriot will try to punish a citizen for expressing an honest opinion on any subject. It is a slander on our system of government, to suppose any one can be punished for writing or speaking opinions that he sincerely entertains. Wherever a man is prohibited from uttering his honest convictions on the subject of Slavery, or any other subject, there is an odious despotism which ought to be trodden indignantly under foot by the people. No man, who understands the nature of our government, and is true-hearted in his loyalty to that government, ever did, or ever will, undertake to abridge the right of speech or of the press. The prosecutors of M. Janney, therefore, are not only very dubious Christians, but are utterly disloyal to the first principles of republican government. Such men never will be properly governed until they get under the dominion of some Persian Satrap.

Virginia was disgraced by this demoniacal effort to rob a good man of his money, his liberty, and his fair fame. The fact that, under any law on her statute books, such an infernal outrage on the rights of man can be committed, ought to suffuse every cheek in Virginia with the blush of shame. We talk with a great deal more plainness of Slavery here in Old Kentucky than Mr. Janney ever did in Virginia, for he is one of the mildest of the mild Society of Friends, and always is careful not to be abusive; while we, when we feel indignant, as we sometimes do, when contemplating some vile outrage committed under the Slavery system, use language by no means remarkable for its daintiness.—Now, we should like to see any one prosecute us for speaking our minds freely. Kentucky is the daughter of Virginia, but we can assure our old mother commonwealth, that her daughter State would never tolerate any such proceedings against any individual as were tolerated in Loudoun county, against Samuel M. Janney.

We are glad, for the honor of Virginia, that the Court quashed the proceedings which had been instituted against Mr Janney. We hope his Christian persecutors are satisfied now that even old Virginia, however paralyzed by negro Slavery, has not so entirely forgotten the principles of her revolutionary sons—is not so besotted and sunken in decrepitude as to punish one of her children for maintaining opinions which were cherished by all her great men—by her Washington, Henry, Jefferson, Madison, Wythe, Monroe, and others, worthy to be mentioned in the same breath with these illustrious advocates of the great doctrines of human freedom.

The Reverend Doctor Smith has no affinities with such worthies. They all devoutly believed in the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, and one of them was the author of that document, whose fame will be as imperishable as are the great political truths which it enshrines. But Doctor Smith ridicules the most admired portion of that document which states that all men are created free and equal, and that all men have inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And not satisfied with profaning that great chart of American liberty, he blasphemes the Supreme Being by stating that He regards the wicked system of African Slavery with approval. Oh such a man is a rare preacher of religious and political truth: and he who asserts that the Declaration of Independence does not lie, and that the Sovereign Ruler of the universe does not approve the dark and red catalogue of crimes necessarily associated with Slavery, ought certainly to be imprisoned, and fined, and disgraced!

Mr. Janney's defence of himself, which we now subjoin, is admirable. If it is plain, forcible, and to the point. If it were less full of the spirit of simplicity and candor, we might applaud its masterly ingenuity. We do not wonder that the Court, after listening to it, ordered the proceedings to be quashed. They would have been thoroughly disgraced had they done otherwise. Here is the admirable document:

Having been summoned to appear before the Justices of the County Court of Loudoun, "to show cause why information shall not be filed against me upon the presentment of the Grand Jury, for maintaining, in an article published in 'The Washingtonian,' on the 10th day of August last, *that masters have no right of property* in their slaves," I beg leave to submit to the Court the following good and sufficient reasons why the said information should not be filed.

First. I deny the fact alleged in the presentment. It will be found on a careful examination of the said essay, that so far from maintaining that masters have no right of property in their slaves, I have distinctly stated, in two paragraphs therein, that slaves in Virginia are property. The first of these paragraphs contain my definition of Slavery, viz: "It is based upon a principle recognised in all the slave States, and expressed in the laws of South Carolina in these words. 'Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal*, in the hands of their owners, &c. Slavery, therefore, is that condition in which man is held as a chattel." The second of these paragraphs, towards the close of the essay, is as follows: "A slave is to all intents and purposes a *chattel personal*, and may be taken and sold for his master's debts: he cannot acquire nor hold property: he can make no contract that his master may not annul: he cannot even contract matrimony, for there is no legal marriage for slaves"

Here is a distinct recognition that slaves are property, *in the legal sense of the term*, for by property is meant any thing to which a person has a legal title; and it would be absurd to maintain, that in Virginia the owners of slaves have no legal title, when we know that Slavery is established by law.

In fact this is the very strongest objection I have to the whole system of American Slavery; it degrades men by regarding them as property, and not only as property, but as *chattels personal*.

In this respect it differs from that system of feudal bondage which formerly prevailed in Europe; for the serf was attached to the soil, he could be *sold with it*, but not *without it*, and consequently the family ties were not liable to be broken at the will of the master. Perhaps it may be alleged that the quotation I introduced from the writings of John Wesley does maintain that masters have no right of property in their slaves; but I beg leave to call your attention to the language of Wesley as quoted by me. He says, "It cannot be that either war or contract can give any man *such a property* in another as he has in his sheep and oxen." Now we know that the owner of sheep and oxen can at any time put them to death: but a master cannot put his slave to death without being guilty of homicide or murder, consequently the law does make a distinction between property in man and property in sheep and oxen. But if the sentiment quoted from Wesley will bear the construction put upon it by the Grand Jury, it does not necessarily follow that I adopted it as my own; for we may quote from an author for other purposes than to corroborate our own sentiments. If the quotation from Wesley is at variance with my own expressions in relation to property in man, it cannot reasonably be imputed to me. The object I had in view in quoting from the *founder of Methodism*, while controverting the arguments of a professed Methodist minister, is sufficiently obvious; it was "*to show what genuine Methodism requires in relation to Slavery*." and there was a passage in the manuscript to this effect, when taken to the editor of the Washingtonian, but it was stricken out by his request, in order to spare the feelings of certain individuals.

Having now shown that I did not maintain, as alleged in the presentment, "that masters have no right of property in their slaves." I deem it proper to say, in the language of George Washington, "that it is among my first wishes to see some plan adopted by which Slavery in this country may be abolished by law."*

2ndly. The statute under which this presentment was made, *when taken in connection with the Constitution of Virginia*, does not apply to the case. The Constitution says (Art 3. Sec. 11), "The Legislature shall not pass any law abridging freedom of speech or of the press:" and again it says: "Nor shall any man be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, or otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or beliefs"—that "all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion."

We must not suppose that the Legislature intended to violate this fundamental principle of the Constitution, and, therefore, it is reasonable to construe the statute, so as not to infringe the freedom of speech or of the press, or to impair that religious liberty so solemnly guaranteed to every citizen of Virginia.

It may be shown by reference to the Discipline of the Society of Friends (page 16) that "as a religious Society, we have found it to be our indispensable duty to declare to the world our belief, that Slavery is wholly inconsistent with the benificent precepts of the Christian religion. It therefore remains to be our continued concern, to prohibit our members from holding in bondage our fellow men. And at the present time, we apprehend it to be incumbent on every individual, deeply to consider his own particular share in this testimony. The slow progress in the emancipation of this part of the human family we lament, but, nevertheless, do not despair of their ultimate enlargement. And we desire that Friends may not suffer the deplorable condition of these, our enslaved fellow beings, to lose its force upon their minds, through the delay which the opposition of the interested may occasion in this work of justice and mercy, but rather be animated to consider that the longer the opposition remains, the greater is the necessity, on the side of righteousness and benevo-

* Letter to J. F. Mercer.

lence, for our steady perseverance in pleading their cause."

This extract from our Discipline shows conclusively, that we place our opposition to Slavery on the *ground of a religious concern*. We consider it a duty, on proper occasions, and in the spirit of meekness and love, "to open our months for the dumb, and to plead the cause of the poor and needy." (Prov. xxxi. 8, 9.) But never, on any occasion, has a Friend been known to incite slaves to rebellion, insurrections or rebellion," or to resist oppression by physical force, is contrary to our well known peaceable principles. We believe that the triumphs of philanthropy and Christianity cannot be achieved by coercive means, but by the gentle, persuasive spirit of the Gospel, which, proceeding from the love of God, expands the heart into love for the whole human family. Nor do we feel at liberty to encourage insubordination among slaves, or advise or incite them to leave their masters, for this would be an improper interference with the relations established by law.

Our concern is not to meddle with the slave, but to appeal to the master. Our course is open and aboveboard—our aim is to accomplish a Christian object by Christian means.

Now we must not suppose that the Legislature intended, by the statute referred to, to deprive us of a religious privilege, solemnly guaranteed to us by the Constitution of our native State, and which has been constantly exercised by *the members of our Society, from the foundation of the government down to the present day.*

3rdly. If this Court shall deem that the statute under which this presentment was made, does apply to this case, and it was intended for the cases, then I would respectfully maintain that the statute, being a palpable violation of the Constitution of Virginia, has not the force of law, and it is the duty of the Judiciary to disregard it. The Court will find a precedent for this course in the case of Peter Kemper vs. Mary Hawkins, recorded in "A Collection of Cases decided in the General Court of Virginia." (Phila. Edition, page 20.)

In this case, which was decided in the year 1793, a statute of the Legislature was unanimously set aside, on the ground that it was contrary to the Constitution of Virginia.

Judge Roane, in giving his opinion, said: "I now think that the Judiciary may, and ought, not only to refuse to execute a law expressly repugnant to the Constitution, but also one which is, by a plain and natural construction, in opposition to the fundamental principles thereof. If the Legislature infringe the Constitution, it is no longer fixed; it is not this year what it was the last, and the interests of the people are wholly at the mercy of the Legislature." (Page 38.)

Judge Henry said: "I concur most heartily with my brothers who have gone before me, in the last two points, that the law in question unconstitutional, ought not to be executed; the injunction, therefore, must be overruled; and this opinion I form, not from a view of the memorials, nor from writers who know not the blessings of free government, but as they were seen and felt through the prospect of future times, but from *honest reason, common sense*, and the great letter of a free constitution." (Page 66.)

Judge Tucker said, in concluding his remarks: "From all these instances, it appears to me, that this deduction clearly follows, viz.: 'The Judiciary *are bound* to take notice of the Constitution, as the *first law of the land*, and that *whatever is contrary thereto, is not the law of the land.*'" (Page 81.)

I would, moreover, suggest, that the statute now under consideration has been recently changed in some of its features, since which I believe there has been no judicial decision under it.

4thly. I would respectfully call the attention of the Court to the circumstances under which my review of W. A. Smith's address was written. A person from another County, professing to be interested in Education, has recently traversed the County of Loudoun, and at several places publicly maintained that Slavery is right in itself, and is sanctioned by the Bible; he had even ventured to call in question, and to ridicule the leading doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, as may be seen by an editorial article in the "Loudoun Well-Digger," published the same week that the lecture was delivered in Leesburg. And can it be possible that freedom of speech and of the press are so completely prostrated in Virginia, that a native citizen of the County may not be permitted to answer an address thus publicly delivered, in which were maintained doctrines at variance with the sentiments of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry, and all the great Statesmen of Virginia? The Court will find on examination of the essay for which I have been prosecuted, that it is moderate and temperate in its tone, regarding all views adverse to its own, and that it has had in prospect for the feelings of my fellow-citizens, whose education and circumstances have caused them to view this subject in a different light from that in which I have seen it.

So careful was I not to give offence, that I erased from it a quotation from Stephen Merrill, which was too strong for the nerves of some sensitive people in Loudoun; and on handing the manuscript to the editor, C. C. McIntyre, who is also a member of the Court, I requested him to examine it, and strike out any passage that was calculated to do harm. He did examine it with that object, and a clause was stricken out, showing the purpose for which the quotation from Wesley was made; but it ought to have been retained, as subsequent events have shown.

In conclusion, I beg leave to remark, that on the from denying that slaves in Virginia are legally the property of their owners, I asserted that "they are to all intents and purposes chattels personal;" and this is the main ground of my opposition to the whole system of Slavery, for from this root springs all its manifold evils.

Being desirous to pay all due respect to the dignity of the Court, and the laws of my country, I trust that my ignorance of legal forms, in the preparation of this answer, will be considered as a plea, that the Court will protect me in the rights secured by our Constitution to the humblest citizen.

S. M. JANNEY.

Affidavit of S. M. Janney.

I hereby certify to the Court, that in the publication in the "Washingtonian," for which I have been prosecuted by the Grand Jury, I had no intention to violate the laws of the State. Given under my hand this 11th day of the 6th month, 1850.

S. M. JANNEY.

In the month of July, 1849, two publications were made in my paper (the Washingtonian) over the signature of S. M. Janney, intended as answers to a speech delivered in the Court House at Leesburg, in the same month, by the Rev. Mr. Smith, on the subject of Slavery.

The Grand Jury of the County of Loudoun having felt it to be its duty to take cognizance of these publications, and to found a presentment thereon, against Mr. Janney, I was called on to testify in behalf of Mr. Janney, to make the following statements in connection with the publication.

When he referred to answers to Mr. Smith's speech were handed to me for publication in my paper, by Mr. Janney, I hesitated to publish them therein, not because I viewed them as violating the law, but because I thought that the subject involved (Slavery) had better be agitated as little as possible. Mr. Janney said that the pieces were but *answers* (as was the fact) to a person who had come amongst us and publicly discussed the subject, and insinuated, that if it was but fair they should appear, and thus both sides be heard. He further said that I could make any alterations I might think proper, or strike out any portions of them I might desire; manifesting a disposition and wish to publish nothing in the paper which might appear to be uncalled for or censurable. And as an evidence of the sincerity of this expressed disposition, he (Mr. Janney) struck out of one of the manuscript pieces a paragraph relating to Wesley's sentiments and the Methodists, at my request, desiring to avoid the publication in my paper of any thing which might appear to side with either of the two divisions of the Methodist Church, existing in this community.

It is further due to Mr. Janney to state that, from his conversation about the answers when handed to me for publication, I felt assured he did not look upon them as at all conflicting with the law, and also that it was not his wish to publish any thing which would violate it. Such was certainly my view of his publications, for had I looked upon them as incendiary in their nature, and therefore obnoxious to the law, they assuredly never would have been given to my paper.

Signed, C. C. McINTYRE.

C. C. McIntyre this day made oath before me, a Justice of the Peace for the County of Loudoun, that the above statements are, to the best of his knowledge and belief, substantially true. Given under my hand this 8th June, 1850. F. W. LUCKETT, *J. P.*

POPULATION OF MASSACHUSETTS.—We gave yesterday a statement of the population of the several counties of Massachusetts, except the towns (few towns having as yet made no returns.) Since that, we learn that the population of Worcester is about 125,000. This will make the population in the State to be nearly one hundred of 970,000. At the census in 1840 it was 740,000. Gain in ten years, 230,000. Middlesex is still the most populous county, as it has been for years. There are three counties containing over 100,000 inhabitants. The increase in the counties bordering upon railroads is quite remarkable.—*Boston Transcript, Saturday.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1850.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

[*Phonographic Report by Dr. Stone.*]

SPEECH OF WENDELL PHILLIPS.

MR. PRESIDENT:

I wish to say one word in regard to the remarks which have been addressed to us, in order that the Anti-Slavery enterprise may stand aright before the nation. It might be judged from the tone of the last speaker, that the Abolitionists see an enemy and an obstacle in the Bible. He has been entreating us to have greater regard for the Bible He has been endeavoring to impress upon us reverence for that book. You might draw the inference that we needed such entreaties. Now, in behalf of the Abolitionists, let me say, we have nothing to do with the Bible in regard to its merits or its faults except in one point: does it sustain or rebuke Slavery? If any speaker wanders beyond that, he speaks on his own responsibility; he speaks that for which this Society is not responsible. Perhaps it may be impossible for him to avoid expressing his private opinions of the Bible as to other points; in the course of illustrating some Anti-Slavery topic. Yet you see to what use he makes his illustrations. And when my friend Foster introduced some speculations of his own, on other points than Slavery, he had no right to do it otherwise than as individuals.

Now, the friend who has just spoken will, I think, grant us this: that no speaker, unless it be Mr. Foster, has entered beyond Slavery. Is not Slavery fair matter of discussion; that our Anti-Slavery speakers have never yet allowed that the Bible sustained Slavery, that we have felt no need, therefore, to throw it overboard. And although we may put the question like my friend Wright, What would you do in case Slavery is unconstitutional, but it be remanded, that the Anti-Slavery enterprise puts such circumstances as merely fictitious, hypothetical, and claims the Bible as on its own side. [Prolonged applause.]

Remember, that although we feel there is enough in mere humanity, without the Bible, to condemn Slavery—that the verdict against it is so self-evident as to destroy the title of any book to be thought inspired which sanctions such a system; still we, so far from bringing any such accusation against the Bible, have always claimed it in behalf of justice and liberty. It is from Moses Stuart, it is from Daniel Webster, it is from the pulpits and the politicians that this attack on the Bible comes, and not from us. [Loud cheers.] I know I am repeating things abundantly well known to all our friends, but it is often the result of such speeches as we have just heard that the audience go away under a wrong impression. I cannot but say that every thing that has been said, that the principles of these resolutions, that the substratum of all that has been spoken, all claim the Bible as a basis; and that, confident the Bible is on our side, we will not be forced into any position that seems doubtful to it. We have nothing to quarrel with this Community.

Because the clergy of our little day and neighborhood pervert the Scriptures, shall that make us disbelieve them? No matter for the texts: enough for us to know that on every field where justice has triumphed, the Bible has been on our side; that wherever humanity has bled it—humanity, in every step of its progress, has caught watchwords from its pages. Freedom of thought was won by those who would read it in spite of Popes; freedom of speech by those who would translate it in spite of Princes; and that Bible spirit of respect for the feelings of my fellow-citizens, whose education and circumstances have caused them to view this subject in a different light from that in which I have seen it.

So careful was I not to give offence, that I erased from it a quotation from Stephen Merrill, which was too strong for the nerves of some sensitive people in Loudoun; and on handing the manuscript to the editor, C. C. McIntyre, who is also a member of the Court, I requested him to examine it, and strike out any passage that was calculated to do harm. He did examine it with that object, and a clause was stricken out, showing the purpose for which the quotation from Wesley was made; but it ought to have been retained, as subsequent events have shown.

In conclusion, I beg leave to remark, that on the from denying that slaves in Virginia are legally the property of their owners, I asserted that "they are to all intents and purposes chattels personal;" and this is the main ground of my opposition to the whole system of Slavery, for from this root springs all its manifold evils.

Being desirous to pay all due respect to the dignity of the Court, and the laws of my country, I trust that my ignorance of legal forms, in the preparation of this answer, will be considered as a plea, that the Court will protect me in the rights secured by our Constitution to the humblest citizen.

S. M. JANNEY.

Affidavit of S. M. Janney.

I hereby certify to the Court, that in the publication in the "Washingtonian," for which I have been prosecuted by the Grand Jury, I had no intention to violate the laws of the State. Given under my hand this 11th day of the 6th month, 1850.

S. M. JANNEY.

In the month of July, 1849, two publications were made in my paper (the Washingtonian) over the signature of S. M. Janney, intended as answers to a speech delivered in the Court House at Leesburg, in the same month, by the Rev. Mr. Smith, on the subject of Slavery.

The Grand Jury of the County of Loudoun having felt it to be its duty to take cognizance of these publications, and to found a presentment thereon, against Mr. Janney, I was called on to testify in behalf of Mr. Janney, to make the following statements in connection with the publication.

When he referred to answers to Mr. Smith's speech were handed to me for publication in my paper, by Mr. Janney, I hesitated to publish them therein, not because I viewed them as violating the law, but because I thought that the subject involved (Slavery) had better be agitated as little as possible. Mr. Janney said that the pieces were but *answers* (as was the fact) to a person who had come amongst us and publicly discussed the subject, and insinuated, that if it was but fair they should appear, and thus both sides be heard. He further said that I could make any alterations I might think proper, or strike out any portions of them I might desire; manifesting a disposition and wish to publish nothing in the paper which might appear to be uncalled for or censurable. And as an evidence of the sincerity of this expressed disposition, he (Mr. Janney) struck out of one of the manuscript pieces a paragraph relating to Wesley's sentiments and the Methodists, at my request, desiring to avoid the publication in my paper of any thing which might appear to side with either of the two divisions of the Methodist Church, existing in this community.

It is further due to Mr. Janney to state that, from his conversation about the answers when handed to me for publication, I felt assured he did not look upon them as at all conflicting with the law, and also that it was not his wish to publish any thing which would violate it. Such was certainly my view of his publications, for had I looked upon them as incendiary in their nature, and therefore obnoxious to the law, they assuredly never would have been given to my paper.

Signed, C. C. McINTYRE.

C. C. McIntyre this day made oath before me, a Justice of the Peace for the County of Loudoun, that the above statements are, to the best of his knowledge and belief, substantially true. Given under my hand this 8th June, 1850. F. W. LUCKETT, *J. P.*

NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

[*Phonographic Report by Dr. Stone.*]

SPEECH OF WENDELL PHILLIPS.

MR. PRESIDENT:

I wish to say one word in regard to the remarks which have been addressed to us, in order that the Anti-Slavery enterprise may stand aright before the nation. It might be judged from the tone of the last speaker, that the Abolitionists see an enemy and an obstacle in the Bible. He has been entreating us to have greater regard for the Bible He has been endeavoring to impress upon us reverence for that book. You might draw the inference that we needed such entreaties. Now, in behalf of the Abolitionists, let me say, we have nothing to do with the Bible in regard to its merits or its faults except in one point: does it sustain or rebuke Slavery? If any speaker wanders beyond that, he speaks on his own responsibility; he speaks that for which this Society is not responsible. Perhaps it may be impossible for him to avoid expressing his private opinions of the Bible as to other points; in the course of illustrating some Anti-Slavery topic. Yet you see to what use he makes his illustrations. And when my friend Foster introduced some speculations of his own, on other points than Slavery, he had no right to do it otherwise than as individuals.

Now, the friend who has just spoken will, I think, grant us this: that no speaker, unless it be Mr. Foster, has entered beyond Slavery. Is not Slavery fair matter of discussion; that our Anti-Slavery speakers have never yet allowed that the Bible sustained Slavery, that we have felt no need, therefore, to throw it overboard. And although we may put the question like my friend Wright, What would you do in case Slavery is unconstitutional, but it be remanded, that the Anti-Slavery enterprise puts such circumstances as merely fictitious, hypothetical, and claims the Bible as on its own side. [Prolonged applause.]

Remember, that although we feel there is enough in mere humanity, without the Bible, to condemn Slavery—that the verdict against it is so self-evident as to destroy the title of any book to be thought inspired which sanctions such a system; still we, so far from bringing any such accusation against the Bible, have always claimed it in behalf of justice and liberty. It is from Moses Stuart, it is from Daniel Webster, it is from the pulpits and the politicians that this attack on the Bible comes, and not from us. [Loud cheers.] I know I am repeating things abundantly well known to all our friends, but it is often the result of such speeches as we have just heard that the audience go away under a wrong impression. I cannot but say that every thing that has been said, that the principles of these resolutions, that the substratum of all that has been spoken, all claim the Bible as a basis; and that, confident the Bible is on our side, we will not be forced into any position that seems doubtful to it. We have nothing to quarrel with this Community.

Because the clergy of our little day and neighborhood pervert the Scriptures, shall that make us disbelieve them? No matter for the texts: enough for us to know that on every field where justice has triumphed, the Bible has been on our side; that wherever humanity has bled it—humanity, in every step of its progress, has caught watchwords from its pages. Freedom of thought was won by those who would read it in spite of Popes; freedom of speech by those who would translate it in spite of Princes; and that Bible spirit of respect for the feelings of my fellow-citizens, whose education and circumstances have caused them to view this subject in a different light from that in which I have seen it.

So careful was I not to give offence, that I erased from it a quotation from Stephen Merrill, which was too strong for the nerves of some sensitive people in Loudoun; and on handing the manuscript to the editor, C. C. McIntyre, who is also a member of the Court, I requested him to examine it, and strike out any passage that was calculated to do harm. He did examine it with that object, and a clause was stricken out, showing the purpose for which the quotation from Wesley was made; but it ought to have been retained, as subsequent events have shown.

In conclusion, I beg leave to remark, that on the from denying that slaves in Virginia are legally the property of their owners, I asserted that "they are to all intents and purposes chattels personal;" and this is the main ground of my opposition to the whole system of Slavery, for from this root springs all its manifold evils.

Being desirous to pay all due respect to the dignity of the Court, and the laws of my country, I trust that my ignorance of legal forms, in the preparation of this answer, will be considered as a plea, that the Court will protect me in the rights secured by our Constitution to the humblest citizen.

S. M. JANNEY.

Affidavit of S. M. Janney.

I hereby certify to the Court, that in the publication in the "Washingtonian," for which I have been prosecuted by the Grand Jury, I had no intention to violate the laws of the State. Given under my hand this 11th day of the 6th month, 1850.

S. M. JANNEY.

In the month of July, 1849, two publications were made in my paper (the Washingtonian) over the signature of S. M. Janney, intended as answers to a speech delivered in the Court House at Leesburg, in the same month, by the Rev. Mr. Smith, on the subject of Slavery.

The Grand Jury of the County of Loudoun having felt it to be its duty to take cognizance of these publications, and to found a presentment thereon, against Mr. Janney, I was called on to testify in behalf of Mr. Janney, to make the following statements in connection with the publication.

When he referred to answers to Mr. Smith's speech were handed to me for publication in my paper, by Mr. Janney, I hesitated to publish them therein, not because I viewed them as violating the law, but because I thought that the subject involved (Slavery) had better be agitated as little as possible. Mr. Janney said that the pieces were but *answers* (as was the fact) to a person who had come amongst us and publicly discussed the subject, and insinuated, that if it was but fair they should appear, and thus both sides be heard. He further said that I could make any alterations I might think proper, or strike out any portions of them I might desire; manifesting a disposition and wish to publish nothing in the paper which might appear to be uncalled for or censurable. And as an evidence of the sincerity of this expressed disposition, he (Mr. Janney) struck out of one of the manuscript pieces a paragraph relating to Wesley's sentiments and the Methodists, at my request, desiring to avoid the publication in my paper of any thing which might appear to side with either of the two divisions of the Methodist Church, existing in this community.

It is further due to Mr. Janney to state that, from his conversation about the answers when handed to me for publication, I felt assured he did not look upon them as at all conflicting with the law, and also that it was not his wish to publish any thing which would violate it. Such was certainly my view of his publications, for had I looked upon them as incendiary in their nature, and therefore obnoxious to the law, they assuredly never would have been given to my paper.

Signed, C. C. McINTYRE.

C. C. McIntyre this day made oath before me, a Justice of the Peace for the County of Loudoun, that the above statements are, to the best of his knowledge and belief, substantially true. Given under my hand this 8th June, 1850. F. W. LUCKETT, *J. P.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1850.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

COCHITUATE HALL, Tuesday Eve'g, May 28.

SPEECH OF WENDELL PHILLIPS.

I would propose, Sir, that if the resolutions which were laid upon the table, in the course of the day, be read, they may be the house.

A Voice—Mr. May is not in the hall.

Mr. Phillips—It will be necessary that we proceed without reading the resolutions. I suppose that they can be read at some future stage of the meeting. I presume that I shall be in order if I keep within the limits of the resolutions.

I differ some little from one of the speakers this afternoon in regard to that degree of conscience and conviction of right which should be attributed to the community about us. One of our friends thought, if I understood him aright, that the time had come when no one would dare to stand up and defend the position of the slaveholder. If I understood him correctly, he thought that we had already done our work so completely, that neither the slaveholder himself, nor any one else in the community, would have the hardihood, basing his defence on the idea that slaveholding was right, or on any other hypothesis, to defend the character of a slaveholder from the charge of O'Connell, that he was 'the most despicable person in the universe.' I read, a few days ago, a sentiment of kind in the New York Observer—and that paper represents the sentiments of a very large portion of the Northern States—I read a sentiment of this kind: 'Some of the very best people in the country are for slaveholders.'

Mr. Foster said that no one would venture upon an Anti-Slavery platform to defend Slavery, in the presence of the Abolitionists of the country.

Mr. Phillips—What I understood the speaker to allude to was the state of the public mind upon the subject. It seems to me that the public is still, to a great extent, unwilling to have Slavery spoken of in the common affairs of life, the rightfulness of the relation of master and slave, and that when we want to note our progress, we must trace it by other signs than these. I should agree with him in regard to the great amount of Anti-Slavery sentiment which has been in the land for years. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have brought people to consider. That is the only triumph of which we can at present boast. We have caught the ear, and to some extent we have alarmed the conscience of the community. We know very well that the time was when public sentiment, not only in the South, but in this country, with hardly an exception, sustained the Constitution of the United States, sustained the duties of citizenship under that instrument, and all the relations which it imposes upon the Northern States toward the slaveholder. At the present moment, we have to deal with a very different state of public sentiment. We have to deal with a public sentiment which is willing to discuss the question, (strange as it may seem!) What is the duty of a Christian man in regard to a law which his conscience deems wicked? and some of them have had the audacious hardihood to come openly to the persuasion that it is the duty of a Christian man to refuse obedience to such a law! This is our doctrine.

Our friend thought Mr. Webster would not dare to return a fugitive slave, and told him of the peril he would run if he attempted it in this city. Mark you! We have achieved a greater triumph than that. In the Senate of the United States, on a certain day of March, a Northern man with a Northern heart, in Mason's bill, in all its provisions to its fullest extent, consent that speech home. It was printed in three editions, revised by himself, and sent home to his district a certain opinion of Massachusetts upon the subject could be gathered and rolled upon his head, it was not till he found that what he had deemed the solid earth of New England was falling, crumbling beneath him, and had been undermined, that Mr. Webster, through the columns of the Boston Courier, comes out and tells it he known that he is not willing to endorse that bill. With the nation for stake-holders, we have made the lion retreat after he had put his foot down. The despised Abolitionists, whom he could not find befitting epithets to describe, have driven him up his fox and hounds! [Cheers.] It has been done in spite of nine hundred and eighty-seven retainers whom he has left endorsing that very pledge; and now he slips his own neck out of the yoke. [Applause.] It has been done to the shame of all manliness, as well as consistency. [Cheers.]

The great masses of mankind never reason; they only feel. They are to be addressed through their sentiments, and not through their intellect. It is only by the certain but slow movement of the feelings that you can change a popular position. Now, the Constitution of the United States may be Anti-Slavery or pro-slavery; the great mass of the community, broken up into sects, immersed in the cares of the day which is passing over them, cannot stop to listen to you. But there is one salient point. Slavery lays its vile hand on the Northern freeman for the service of the South-ern slaveholder. That is practical; that is felt. You remember that when Sterne wanted to impress on the popular mind the horrors of imprisonment for debt, he did not discuss the abstract doctrine of the legality of imprisonment, but he opened the prison-door, and pointed to the solitary prisoner pining in his living grave. With his single appeal to the sentiment of England, how much he did to hold up the hands of John Howard!

Now, what reasoning cannot do, the fugitive slave, in the form that God gave him, does, when he stands at your threshold and asks a morsel of bread. He is the Anti-Slavery argument against the United States Constitution. [Cheers and hisses.] In comparison with that appeal, all the eloquence of Daniel Webster is as a drop in the bucket, and the small dust of the balance. [Applause.] This appeal has been made over and over again, thanks to the Abolitionists, in every village of the country. Brandied as the enemies of the Constitution, they have answered by helping and encouraging the slave. Onward he has come. And weightier than Constitutions, stronger than laws, is one Ellen Craft, to open the hearts of Northern freemen, and to make them say, 'Thou shalt not be shot.' [Cheers and hisses.] The retainers of Daniel Webster may hiss that sentiment; but remember, Daniel himself is cowed. [Approbation and disapprobation.] The nine hundred and eighty-seven men whom he has left in the slough of their constitutional sentiments, may hiss at the sentiment; but he has left it in my. He says the sentence was be-*witched*, [laughter,] and he wishes to change the position of that word 'which,' so that it can allude to amendments he had to offer, but *forgot*. As Henry Ward Beecher said of him, 'The memory seems to have been paralyzed for a long time'

There was a time when Mr. Webster urged the Senate to declare war with Great Britain, and said that if certain territory on our north-eastern boundary were not yielded, it would be the duty of the government to march into the territory before the next fourth day of July. He came to New York, and the merchants trembled for their property school. 'Do you intend,' said they to him, 'to make a warlike demonstration?' 'No,' said he, 'it was a mistake of the reporters. I did not say the next fourth day of July, but some fourth of July.' So now, it was not Mr. Mason's bill, which he was intending to support, but *some* bill, to *some* extent, with *some* amendments. [Laughter.] I do not intend to extend my remarks upon the conduct of this distinguished man. No! I am reminded by that article in the Courier appearing just after the criticisms of the 'Old Whig' in the Atlas (not to speak of the Whig, taking of his positions back in the face of the country—I am reminded of an anecdote of Judge Story, defending a man against his wife, who seemed the stronger of the two. 'Gentlemen of the jury,' said he, 'my client is a subdued man.' [Laughter.] I am reminded by Daniel Webster's conduct of his speech what he ought never to have put in, and inserting what he ought never to have omitted, it seems to me that he is now *a subdued man.* [Increased mirth.]

Suppose that he had promulgated similar sentiments in 1820, before the Anti-Slavery enterprise was started. Who would have found fault with him? Where are the Boston lawyers or the Boston judges or the Boston presses who would have found fault with him? It is the peculiarity of 1850, that it finds a public sentiment to rebuke a man who has the courage that he would carry out the Constitution with alacrity. The sentiment which rebukes a man for that is rotten, whether consciously or not, on the subject of the Constitution; and though we may not be permitted to utter our sentiments, without rebuke, yet the time of our triumph is not far distant. One of the most important points of the Constitution is disregarded. There is a savage growl from the constituents at home, which swears that the fugitive slave shall not be surrendered. It seems to me that our duty as abolitionists is fulfilled, if we can keep the mind intent upon this point. Let us not allow it to be diverted to other questions. Let us not allow it to be squandered upon Free Soil, or Texas, or Cuba, questions that may be confounded with party politics, and with a thousand disputed points. Here is the point every man can understand. Here is the Crime of the Constitution, without which Mr. Calhoun acknowledged that the Constitution was of little worth to the Southern States; and Mr. Calhoun was aware of the tendency of Northern sentiment when he said it. You remember that he said, 'Slaves are property, sir, property as much as any property, and laws are worth nothing without a public sentiment in their favors.' This is a point which comes up in daily life. This is plain, small, comprehensible, easily managed in argument. The position of the parties has given it to us. It is astonishing, if you look back to the Whig Congress, to see how universal has been the dealing with this topic, the recapture of fugitive slaves. Cass and Seward, and Calhoun, Toombs, Foote, Baldwin, Julian, Hale, and Giddings, Webster and Winthrop and Mann, and I might go on so many more, have been unanimous in the opinion that the Constitution of the Northern mind to come up to its duty in this respect. Now that we have obtained the public ear upon this topic, let us keep it—Sift the question and analyze it. Oblige the divines to discuss it. The New York Observer says—'We are abolitionists. By what right do you come to our pulpits and preach on fugitive slaves to their masters? No, by no manner of means We will mind the Constitution until we can mend it.' The Boston Recorder says—'It is the duty of a Christian to obey a wicked law till we can change it. And remember that the general good will prevail in the end. My friend Foster cited Webster, noon a provision of the Jewish law that a Jew was not to sell unhealthy meat to a Jew, but might to others. Professor Stuart seems to go on that principle in regard to fugitive slaves. He volunteers a defence to Mr. Webster's position, that position from which Daniel Webster was driven by the indignation of the Abolitionists, he says, 'fanatically cry out against us, 'Thou shalt not deliver to his master the slave that has escaped from his master unto thee.' This was intended by Moses to secure for the fugitive servant who had once got free, a dwelling place where he should enjoy all the rights of religious privileges. He was not to be returned to his master. Why? Because that master was heathen. And consequently, if Moses had directed the slave to be returned, he would be removed from the full blaze of the Jewish religion, and the heathen would be thrust out the man whom God had brought into the sunlight back into the darkness of Idolatry. Now, says Professor Stuart, this provision of Deuteronomy, he says, 'applies to the case of a Christian slave.' If we return a fugitive slave to South Carolina, we do not return him to a heathen master, but to a brother Christian. Consequently no Christian conscience need to be at all troubled by the quotation of this law of Deuteronomy, as it has no application in the case.' Well, I suppose, Mr. President, that this argument is a fair specimen of the kind of the slave of a heathen or a Jew, or even of a Roman Catholic (for I think Professor Stuart would include him) should escape, he is not to be returned.

This is the defence of Slavery. And mark you! The abolitionists have forced them to defend it in this way. The time has been when they would not condescend to argue the question. Now there is a division in their own household. Eminent men in their midst have declared that the church, so long as it fosters Slavery among its church members, is no Church. Eminent men have declared that it is the duty of the Christian man to return fugitive slaves. Thus far the abolitionists have compelled them to assent to their principles; at least, have set them by the ears.

I take encouragement from this state of things. Never before has the clergy of the country found it necessary to enter the pulpit to defend the Constitution of the United States. We have assailed it for just ten years as a Pro-Slavery Constitution. We have just driven the enemy up to this point; that he deems it necessary to defend the Constitution. What did the apostles do when the greatest blessing that God could grant him? 'Behold Saul is praying.' Some adversary had written a book.' Some 'adversary' must have put it into the hearts of a great man at Washington to make a speech, and of another great man in Andover to back him up. [Hisses and cheers.]

If we had done nothing else in the discussion of the twenty years but make some men profess their individual readiness to return fugitive slaves, to walk up to the limit of constitutional obligation, and fairly and frankly confess that they intend to perform it, and then make others defend Slavery, having pledged themselves to particular measures, in my opinion, we should have done a great deal. The battle is half won when the lines are clearly drawn.

The Chairman—The audience will be as quiet as the nature of the business will admit. We did the best we could for accomodation. I think if the audience are quiet they will be enabled to hear with satisfaction.

Mr. Phillips—I do not desire, Mr. Chairman, to linger on this point longer than its importance demands. At the same time, it seems to me that the discussions of the afternoon in relation to the Bible, and in the morning in some respects in relation to the Constitution, are both brought to a focus by a practical question of this nature. You must get a test of the public mind. Now we get one; now we get another. They are more prepared to vote the Anti-Slavery cause. The first test that presented itself was the right of petition.

The time was when John Quincy Adams did not dare to profess himself the friend of the right of petition without smoothing that confession in the ears of his associates by declaring that he would vote against the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia. Then you come to another question, Texas; then to that of Free Soil. These are in somewhat, a series of a chain, somewhat remote from the Anti-Slavery cause. This session of Congress has drawn the lists closer. The South has asked a new hill, and the North is discussing it. And the Northern leaders are asking what is the sentiment of it. Let us examine it as carefully as we can for the information of these the blind vassals of party leaders; for of parties it is always true as of snakes, that the 'tail moves the head.' We must see if the little men of the North interested thus. They are the leaders, not the Cassos, not the Clays. The great men wait for the letters from home. They stand ready to carry out that sentiment which we have sown in cross. And when by the drudgery of years of labor we have built up an Anti-Slavery highway, doubt not that some uncoiled and dainty leader in political pumps and silk stockings will consent to walk over it; but mean while it is to be built. And for this work we never had while it is to be built. And for this work we never had such a god send as these pledges of Northern men to the duty of returning fugitive slaves.

The time has been when if you asked a Whig if he would return fugitive slaves, he would have answered, 'Is thy servant a dog to do this thing?' Now, in 1850, you answer—'Not a dog, only a Webster. [Applause and hisses.] Why, do you hiss your Constitution? Do you hiss the law for supporting the Constitution, or Daniel Webster for supporting it? ['Both.'] I am ready to join in opposition to him. Let my man stand up before the New England public and profess his readiness to return the fugitive slave, and lay his hand on the bond-man, and help the slave carrier carry him back to bondage, and see how like vegetation before the early frost, his prospects will wither. No! no man will undertake it. We have placed that stock at a bad discount. And that is the first triumph against the Constitution. It is the only palpable point on which we meet it. And the pledges of Washington are our capital. They are the facts on which we are to go before the people. And I exhort abolitionists to lay aside other issues. Let the Bible shift for itself. It can live and stand on its own foundation. Let us hold to their pledges and frankly enters of those great men who have fully and frankly avowed before the American people that the Constitution demands the return of the bondmen, the return of her Kossuths back to Czars, the return of woman, back to their masters, children back to their cradle spoilers, and that they, American Citizens, are not only bound, but willing to do our dirty work. Let our text; and if we do not make every man in Congress heartily ashamed of pledge upon the surrender clause of the Constitution, it will be our fault.

I see the greatest prospect of success upon this question, the relations of the citizen to the government. We have been discussing it among ourselves. The world begins to discuss it. Let us urge that discussion upon them. It is not possible to discuss it often without the Constitution falling somewhat in the reverence with which it is looked upon. Why? It would seem that we were but children. It seems to me to be the opinion of politicians that we have neither sense nor morality. On the occasion of the last anniversary of the Liberty man war, Mr. Webster says that he saw that plot half accomplished which would turn the Constitution of the United States into a monster and a curse. Well the Constitution of Texas, which we helped to make the Constitution a monster and a curse, rises in place, in the Senate of the United States, and pours out the vials of his hotest wrath against the Abolitionists for not loving his 'monster and curse;' as if it were *always* boys play, as if he used words for counters.

I was saying that that great statesman had denounced the Abolitionists, and he assigns why we discuss him is, that this is his home We do not, like some religious bodies, attack sin on the banks of the Ganges, and ignore that on the Potomac.

I hold to no right of attack upon those in private life. The same rule applies here with regard to criticism as in Turkey with regard to the bow-string. If the sultan feels it to be his duty, he has a bow-string up his right to bow-string him But let him once take office, then the Sultan claims and exercises the power. A man may in private life state his right and intention to return slaves, without any very public criticism from us; but when a man is sent to Congress, and there utters a sentiment which we think ought to bear his name then his pledges and his sentiments are public property. Like all other facts, for he is himself a fact, he is a subject of criticism. When, therefore, I criticise the pledges of Webster, it is not as Daniel Webster that I criticise him, but it is as the representative of Massachusetts as a hunting-ground, without one little voice going up from that State in remonstrance.

As for abuse of Daniel Webster, I should like to see the man so vain of his power of satirical eloquence as to attempt to abuse him. The Abolitionist pauses when he reaches that last speech of Webster not only at what that speech says, but at what it omitted to say. He sees that he left it out. The Abolitionist sees that he kept in his desk the only sentence that he claims to have prepared in behalf of Massachusetts; and that now, with a claim almost ludicrous from its lateness and its utter distance from the ground of incredibility, it is asserted that he has in that same desk an amendment to Mr. Mason's bill, securing to the fugitive slave the trial by jury, and that was omitted too. 'The part of Hamlet omitted from the play by particular request.' [Three cheers for Hamlet.]

The Chairman—You will be dealt with if you interrupt the meeting.

Mr. Phillips—I recollect a story of a man who was eloquently profane; so much so, that when he was in great trouble, his neighbors crowded around him to hear how he would swear. On one occasion, he was going up a steep hill, and the back of his cart having broken, his cargo came tumbling to the ground. His friends followed him to see him and hear his oath when he should learn of the accident. But when he reached the top of the hill, and saw, for the first time, the extent of his misfortune, that his load was entirely gone, he folded his hands, and said, 'I feel utterly unequal to the occasion.' So may we say of this speech. [Laughter.]

Then there are the 987 retainers. As the drunken Duke of Norfolk once said to a tipsy companion in the guter, 'Friend, I cannot help you up, but I will do the best I will lie down by your side. So said the 987; and then he, worse than his Grace of Norfolk's companion, the great man shuffles free from the shackles in which he has bound them. Then again the Abolitionist feels that he has no words for the occasion. He leaves him at the Senate board, where he is cowed at finally case the old Senator from Kentucky, a man who is the consistent representative of the institutions of of the State that has elected him—a man who has spoken more words for liberty, as he understands it, and somewhat as the Abolitionist understands it, than the craven Northern Senator has ever let slip from his lips. Now, the duty of the Abolitionist is to make it impossible in any future continuance of the Anti-Slavery sentiment of Massachusetts shall be so represented on the floor of the United States Senate that we cannot trust it. Boston stands by itself. Its great wealth and manufactures make men pigmies; and they crouch at the feet of the Websters and the Appletons, and we give them up. But outside of the Boston Further off than Palfrey's district, there stand men who are not Abolitionists, but who do not intend to be slave-hunters.

We have stood alone, without the sympathies of the people, and alien to its wishes; but at this point we can unite with the feelings of the good to our aid. And there is not a man who would dare to face of the community, dare to assert, for his reputation's sake, that he would favor the return, or dare in any way have a hand, in the return, of fugitive slaves. [Prolonged cheers.]

Let us not be contented with the half-way measures of jury trial. Let us not claim merely for the slave certain methods

apparently perfect identity of intention (I speak reverently) of the command, Exodus 21. 26-27, and of the one in Deuteronomy of which we are treating, renders it quite certain, that the generally received sense of the latter is the true one

I repeat, however, that a practice, in accordance with your view, of the passage, *may* have been included in the rule, though there is nothing in the Jewish history to warrant such an inference. Perhaps I shall express my own meaning more clearly by presuming, that from time to time—occasionally—cases *may* have presented themselves, of the class you have supposed, and the practice—as a necessary corrolary—has grown into a Rule. Indeed it has long dwelt on my mind, that the *Rule* which *now* governs this branch of the subject—which is now the settled Law of Nations—and a breach of which would *now*, cover any government, or people with infamy—has, probably, in some such mode—grown out of this command. But that it should have been *originally* intended for the foreign fugitive *exclusively*,—that it should *ostensibly invite* him to abscond from his *foreign* master, living in a *foreign land*, (and, with your "*exclusiveness*," it *must* have been so understood) there is no evidence to shew, and is indeed, too preposterous to believe for a moment.

I aim at brevity Rev. Sir, for I hope to be read. I propose, therefore, rather to answer your arguments—so far as I can *infer* them—than to fill my pages with the verbiage of long quotations. You speak of religious privileges,—of the motive, or motives, of this command, —and that the refusal to restore the fugitive to his enraged heathen master, had especial reference to these privileges. You admit, however, that the *servants of the Hebrews enjoyed them*, and I cheerfully corroborate your admission. Beyond all price, indeed, were those priviledges,—and in *your* mind fully justifying both the escape of the foreign fugitive, and the refusal to give him up. I have something to say on this point.

I propose now, Rev. Sir, to deal, in the first instance, with your *admission*, because it necessarily follows, that if those invaluable religious privileges had been withheld from the *Hebrew* servant—if the power of life and death had been held by the master—if the servant might be scourged (even with rigor)—if he had been put to excessive toil—if, moreover, all the laws in reference to him evidently had no other purpose, but to tread out of him, the small remnant of humanity—to destroy, if possible, all sense of accountability to a SUPREME and UNSEEN POWER—and if furthermore indeed the foundation law, of all Christian morals—of all Christian society—"*Marriage*, and the *bed undefiled*" had, and *could have no* reference to him whatever—then is a case presented, which, following your *own* lead, would have justified both *his* escape, and the nonrendition to his master.

Is *such* the condition of the *American* slave? It is, Rev. Sir: and my purpose is now to shew from indisputable authority, namely, the LAWS by which the victims of this very "peculiar institution" are governed, and controlled, that *thus* it is. I quote principally from Judge Stroud's "Sketches of Laws relating to Slavery, in the several States," an unpretending volume of one hundred and eighty pages, Philadelphia Edition, 1827—a date by the wey, five or six years anterior to the formation of any abolition Society. I take the liberty of recommending this Book to your particular acquaintanceship and study.

Page 85 commences with a proposition, "That the Benefits of Education are withheld from the Slave."

Page 88 under the foregoing head is a quotation from a Law of S. Carolina, of 1740, which enacts, that any person or persons whomsoever teaching, or causing any slave, or slaves, to be taught to *write*, shall for *every* such offence forfeit £100 currency. Georgia has an act of the date of 1770 similar to that of S. Carolina, except the penalty, which is £20 sterling.

Page 88, 89. Virginia by her Revised Code 1819, reiterates an enactment, which amounts to this, that meetings of free negroes or mullatoes with slaves, at schools, to teach *reading* or *writing* to slaves, at any hour of the day or night are unlawful assemblages—are to be broken up—and corporal punishment inflicted on the offenders severally, at the discretion of any justice of the peace—not exceeding *twenty lashes*.

Page 89. The second paragraph quotes from a law of South Carolina of 1800. The quotation is too long to copy here. From the parties enumerated—slaves, free negroes, mulatto, and mestizos,—met for the purpose of mental instruction, even with *white* persons—I infer that *religious* meetings are intended, and *these* also, as in the preceding instance, are declared unlawful meetings—are to be broken up, and the offenders punished by, not exceeding *twenty lashes!*

Page 90. The City of Savannah 1818, had (and perhaps *still has*) an ordinance, ordaining that any person teaching any person of color, slave or free, to read or write, be fined thirty dollars, for each offence, and any person of *color*, keeping a school for such purpose, is fined thirty dollars, or imprisoned ten days, and whipped *thirty nine* lashes!

Judge Stroud concludes his proposition thus "apart from the obstacles of law, the condition of Slavery is such, that a slave capable of reading must be, in most of the States, a prodigy indeed. His life is, ordinarily, passed in incessant labor. The laws secure to him no portion of time, in which he may employ himself, at his pleasure. He is awakened from slumber at the call of his master, often before the dawn of the day. He continues his heartless labor, with but slight intermissions, for food and rest, till night has closed around him. Hard worked, and scantily fed, his bodily energies exhausted—without an instructor, and without books (for he has not the means to procure them) he must of necessity remain forever ignorant of the benefits of education."

Page 90, Proposition "The means, for Moral and Religious instruction, are not granted to the slave; on the contrary, the efforts of the humane and charitable to supply these wants are discountenanced by Law."

"One of the plain dictates of the Christian Religion, is a regard for the well-being of our fellow creatures. It is indeed largely insisted upon, as a *duty*, both in the Old and New Testaments. No believer in the Christian Religion can doubt, that the knowledge of its precepts, and promises, will promote the happiness, both here and hereafter of every accountable creature; now will any one deny, that a negro, though a slave, is a member of the human family—is endowed with reason—has a soul which is immortal—and must be accountable to God "for the deeds done in the body." How can such a belief be reconciled with a practice which forbids to the slave, access to the gospel; and *which*, *so far as the masters power* (*to do so*) *extends*, shuts out from him the means of his salvation? "It has been shown" that one of these means, *mental instruction*, is in general entirely withheld from the slave. He cannot learn the scriptures therefore, except as an *auditor*. And yet, in none of the Slave States, are any facilities afforded for the purpose. No *time* is secured to the slave by law: no *place* provided where he can assemble with his fellows to hear *preached* the glad tidings of salvation,"

As to accompanying his *master* to *Church*, Stroud apprehends, that it *rarely* happens, except for *the especial convenience of his master*. The places of worship, compared even with the number of the *whites*, are *few* and altogether inadequate to the religious necessities of the Community.

And how could the rude mind of the slave comprehend a discourse directed to the refined taste and enlarged capacity of his master? Christianity demands that these unfortunate beings be taught to *read*—that buildings be erected for them to worship in—that spiritual teachers be encouraged to devote their time and talents, to the imported service—that time be allowed at the usual seasons to the slaves for the purpose, and *especially* that *laws* be passed, and *enforced*, to prevent the exaction of such severe labor from them, as would prostrate and unfit them from profiting by such opportunities.

Pape 92 presents a curious piece of legislation—*circuitous*,—but traced by Judge S, with considerable ingenuity. Georgia 1792. It seems difficult through any part of its devious course, to lay finger on its object, until it terminates in "*Any assembly or meeting of slaves*, which *may* [possibly] endanger the safety &c., may be broken up—as usual—and every slave found or taken therein, be corrected—WITHOUT TRIAL—by twenty-five stripes with a whip on the bare back &c.

Page 93. S. Carolina, 1800—A severe enactment, somewhat mitigated three years afterwards, more in appearance, however, than in reality.

94. Virginia. Meetings for any pretence are unlawful—are to be dispersed and broken up. Corporal punishment, of course, not forgotten.

Mississippi, the same as Virginia, with a proviso,—that a master may grant a license to attend a place of worship, the minister of which is ordained or licensed—white, of course, he must be—or where two discreet persons appointed by some regular Church or religious society, shall attend."

Page 35. At the second line from the bottom, commences a proposition which reads thus:

"*The master may, at his discretion, inflict any species of punishment upon the person of his slave.*"

This is illustrated by extracts from laws of the several slave States, and suitable comments thereon, commencing on the 36th page and ending at the 44th. Eight pages are evidently too long to quote here, and I therefore give the result in Stroud's own words, which result is, indeed, most fairly and accurately drawn out, and forcibly expressed, namely: "That the master's power to inflict corporal punishment to *any extent*, short of *life* or *limb*, is *fully sanctioned by* LAW in ALL the slaveholding States—that the master, in at least *two* States, is expressly protected, in using the *horse-whip* and *cowskin*, as instruments for leading his slave—that he may with entire impunity, in the same States, load his *slaves with irons*, or subject him to perpetual imprisonment whenever he may so choose—that for cruelly *scalding*, *willfully cutting out the tongue*, putting out an eye, and for *any other dismemberment*, *if proved*, a fine of one hundred pounds currency only is incurred in South Carolina—that though in *all* the slave States, the wilful, deliberate and malicious murder of the slave is now *directed* to be punished with death, yet, as in the case of a *white* offender, none but *whites* can give evidence,—a *conviction* can *seldom*, if EVER, take place."

I find this letter growing under my hands to an extent which I did not anticipate, and therefore I must be more general in my references. And first, I refer you to his list of propositions at page 25, which he has fully illustrated and *proved*, when treating of each separately. That the slave is scantily fed, and clothed, you will find in pages 31 and 34 inclusive—excessively overworked—pages 26 and 30 inclusive. In three States *convicts* (whites) are to be compelled to work 8, 9 and 10 hours severally, out of the 24, according to the season—innocent slaves are to work 14 hours out of the 24, six months in the year. and 15 hours out of 24 for the other six months!

For a systematic and constant endeavor to tread out of the unhappy slave every vestige of intelligence and humanity, I refer you to the entire work, which I again recommend to your diligent and attentive perusal. There is one proposition, (the 11th) page 61, which I have reserved until now for your especial notice, viz.: "Slaves can make no contract." "A slave cannot even contract matrimony"—the associations which takes place amongst slaves, and is *called* matrimony, being properly designated by the word *contubernium* —a relation which has no sanctity, and to which no civil rights are attached. "A slave," says Daniel Dulany, Attorney General for the State of Maryland, "has never maintained an action against the violator of his bed. A slave is not admonished for incontinence, or punished for fornication or adultery; never prosecuted for bigamy, or petty treason for killing a husband being a slave, any more than being admitted to an appeal for murder."

These instances, Rev Sir, constitute but a small part of the *index*, even, to the workings of this "peculiar" and atrocious institution. Can it be that while reasoning from the servitude of the Hebrews, to the abominations of *American* Slavery, you could have made yourself *at all* acquainted with the laws which control the latter? Sir, the bearing and operation of the two systems, severally, are wide as the poles asunder. I can have no doubt whatever, and candid men will admit, that the entire system of Hebrew servitude was controlled by a law of kindness throughout *mitigating* and *humanizing* a *condition* and *relation between master and servant*, in *their* borders, which relation (*without* such intent) I cannot doubt existed at that period in all the surrounding nations. On the contrary, read the book (Strond) from which the foregoing extracts are taken—then read, as a commentary on the laws of American Slavery, a collection of facts under the title of "*American Slavery as it is*," published in 1839, for which facts, the authorities are given, the names of the perpetrators, where resident, dates, and to this hour, so far as I know, uncontradicted; then keep your attention fixed on the 11th proposition of Stroud, that the law does *not* recognize the marriages of slaves, and to the fact that, in reference to it, the "bleaching process" is progressing under this rule of law unpunished and unpunishable: then, if, after all this be faithfully and diligently performed on your part, you shall still persist in considering the two systems *essentially* identical, we shall feel compelled either to wonder at your powers of judgment and discrimination, or to suspect the humanity of your heart.

P. SHAPTER.

General Intelligence.

CASE OF PROFESSOR WEBSTER.

Refusal of the Council to Commute the Punishment of Death--Day of Execution Fixed.

The Governor and Council this morning, when a unanimous report from the Committee of Pardons against a commutation of the punishment of death in the case of Professor Webster, for the murder of Dr. Parkman, was presented. This report was accepted by the Council, one member, Mr. Copeland of Norfolk, voting in the negative. *Friday, August thirtieth*, was fixed as the day of execution.

Below we give the report of the Committee on Pardons, and the address of the Governor to the council:

COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

The Committee on Pardons, to whom was referred the petition of John W. Webster, a convict under sentence of Death, praying, in behalf of himself and his wife and children, the Governor and Council to extend to the petitioner a commutation of the punishment awarded to him: also a copy of the records of the Court, containing the trial and sentence of said Webster, and also sundry other petitions and arguments referring to, or in support of the petition of said Webster—now report:

That, by said record, it appears that said Webster was regularly indicted for the crime of the murder of Dr. George Paraman, and set to the bar of the Supreme Court at the March Term thereof. A. D 1850—and there having been inquired of how he would acquit himself concerning the premises, for answer, said he was not guilty, and thereof put himself upon the country.

Counsel was thereupon assigned to the prisoner. On the 19th of March following, said Webster was again set to the bar to be tried A Jury was empanneled and sworn, and after full hearing on their oaths, declared that the said John W. Webster was guilty. And thereafterwards, viz. on the 1st day of April, in said Court, said Webster being placed at the bar for sentence, it was demanded of him by said Court if he had anything to say wherefore sentence should not be declared upon the premises and verdict aforesaid. To which said Webster nothing further answered.

Thereupon it was considered by the Court, that the said John W. Webster be taken to the Jail whence he came, and thence to the place of execution, and there be hanged by the neck until he be dead.

Since the passing said sentence by said Court, numerous petitions and arguments have been presented to the Executive for the full pardon of said Webster, founded upon the belief and presumption that he never committed even a homicide. Recent events, however, relieve the Committee in a great measure from the consideration of all such arguments and petitions.

On the 2d of July, A. D. 1850, the Rev. Dr. Putnam, by appointment, appeared in behalf of said Webster, before the Committee on Pardons, and read a confession made by said Webster, acknowledging that he committed the homicide, and declaring the manner and circumstances thereof,—and at the same time presented said Webster's petition for a commutation of the sentence aforesaid. The petition and confession were supported by an able argument by Dr. Putnam.

To this confession and argument, and all arguments and evidence supporting it, we have given our most serious and anxious attention, and we have proceeded to consider the same with hearts and minds desirous to know the truth, and our duty, and with a firm purpose to do what both should require.

It seems to your Committee that the sentence in the case of said Webster, having been passed by the Court, after a full and fair trial, in the course of which, all the facts and circumstances which could then be brought to light, were patiently and thoroughly investigated and weighed by the Jury,—and having been fully affirmed, after a careful revision of the law upon trial, since had by the full Court, on solemn argument of both sides, there appears to be no ground for Executive interposition, except it may be found in the subsequent confession of the prisoner.

In this view, the only questions, as it seems to us, are, whether the statements which said Webster now makes in this Confession, of the manner and circumstance of the homicide, are so confirmed by other evidence, or so intrinsically probable, that they ought to be received as true; and if true, whether they justify the Executive in a commutation of the punishment.

To these questions, the minds of the Committee have been most carefully directed, and, as they trust, with no unwillingness on their part to come to an affirmative conclusion, if they could do so consistently with a supreme regard to truth and justice. But after all the considerations which they have been able to bestow upon this confession, and under the light of the evidences and comments with which it has been accompanied and supported, they feel constrained to say, that the effect has not been such as to satisfy our minds, that the position of the case has been materially changed.

In other words, the palliating facts and circumstances set forth in the confession, have not been so confirmed by other evidence and circumstances, as to form a proper and sufficient basis for Executive interference.

To this painful conclusion the Committee have unanimously come.

The Committee therefore respectfully report, that they cannot consistently with what they conceive their duty, recommend a commutation of the sentence, in the case of John W. Webster, as prayed for in his petition.

Nothing now remains for the Committee, in the discharge of this painful duty, but to advise your Excellency in determining upon a time for the Execution, and they name FRIDAY, THE THIRTIETH DAY OF AUGUST NEXT. as the day; and recommend to your Excellency to decide upon that day as the time for the Execution of John W. Webster.

JOHN REED, Chairman.

Council Chamber, July 19, 1850.

GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS.

To the Honorable Council:

The Council having considered and acted on the case of John W. Webster, a convict under sentence of death, it becomes my duty as the Chief Executive Magistrate of the Commonwealth to make a final decision on a question involving the life of the prisoner. I feel the weight of its responsibility. But it is a responsibility found in the path of official duty, and I am not disposed to evade it, or to shrink from it. For eight months past this extraordinary case has created a deep and painful interest among the people of Massachusetts, and of the whole Union Its history is as brief as it is terrible and instructive; every new development in its progress has been more strange, and has increased that interest.

On the 23d day of November, 1849, Dr. George Parkman, a well-known and highly respectable citizen of Boston, left his house and family on business, as was usual for him, and never returned to them His unexpected absence alarmed his family and excited the attention of the people in and around Boston. In the course of a day or two it was understood that the prisoner had said that Dr. Parkman met him at his rooms in the Medical College in the west part of the City, not far from half-past 1 o'clock on the day of of his disappearance, and that he then and there paid him a sum of money, which he, Dr. Parkman, took into his hands and hastily rushed toward the outer-door.

Dr. Parkman was also seen by other persons about the same time of day within forty feet of the door of the College, and walking quickly toward it. These, with other circumstances, directed the public mind toward the College buildings. The next Friday, one week after the disappearance of Dr. Parkman, the dismembered parts of a human body were found in different places in and under the rooms occupied by the prisoner in that College, some of them packed in a tea chest. and other parts in the vault of a privy attached to his laboratory.

Suspicions were strongly fixed on him, and he was arrested and committed to Leverett-st. jail A Coroner's inquest was called, and after a long examination into the facts of the case, conducted in secret, the jury reported that the remains found were parts of the body of the late Dr. George Parkman, that he came to his death by violence in the Medical College in Boston on Friday the 23d day of November, and that he was killed by John W. Webster. The evidence taken before the inquest was not given to the public. In January, 1850, the case was laid before the Grand Jury for the County of Suffolk, and the investigation before that body resulted in finding an indictment against the prisoner for the murder of Dr. Parkman.

He was arraigned on the indictment and pleaded not guilty. Two of the most able and distinguished lawyers of the Commonwealth were upon his own selection, assigned to him as Counsel by the Supreme Court, and his trial before the full bench of that Court fixed on the 19th day of March. Some time before the day of trial the Attorney General furnished the counsel of the prisoner, not only with a list of the names of the witnesses to be called against him, which is required to be done in all capital cases in this Commonwealth, but also with a copy of the testimony taken before the Coroner's Inquest and which had been produced against him before the Grand Jury.

The time appointed for the trial arrived, when four Judges of the Supreme Court were present, and sat during the trial. In pursuance of the provisions of law, sixty jurors had been drawn from the jury box in the County of Suffolk. By law, the prisoner had a right peremptorily, without giving any reason, to challenge twenty jurors, and for good reasons to object to any others whose names might be called. In empannelling the Jury who tried him, the prisoner exercised his peremptory right of challenge in only fourteen instances.

The trial was one of surpassing interest and solemnity, and lasted eleven days. On the part of the prisoner, the case was argued with great earnestness, candor and ability, by Hon. Pliny Merrick, his senior Counsel. After denying that the evidence on the part of the Government was sufficient to prove that the prisoner killed Dr. Parkman at all, the Counsel took the ground that if in any event the Jury should come to the conclusion that he did kill him, then the circumstances of the case were such as to satisfy them that the killing could not have been premeditated, but was the result of an unexpected conflict between the parties and of sudden passion.

This position he endeavored to maintain by an ingenious and powerful appeal to the Jury. The case was closed on the part of the Commonwealth by the Attorney General, by an address of singular point and effect. After the Attorney General had finished his argument, the Court informed the prisoner that he had the right, which he might exercise or not, as he pleased, to make such remarks to the Jury as he saw fit. the prisoner rose and for some time addressed the Jury in his own behalf. An elaborate, clear, and comprehensive charge was given by the Chief Justice after conversation with the other members of the Court who sat with him at the trial.

The Jury retired to their room, and after an absence of three hours late on Saturday evening, returned to the Court with a verdict of guilty. The next Monday morning the prisoner was again brought into Court, and received from the Chief Justice the sentence of the law, which doomed him to suffer death by hanging at such time as the Executive of the Commonwealth should appoint.

In a few days a copy of the record of his conviction was transmitted to the Governor and Council, by the Sheriff of the County of Suffolk, according to the direction of the Statute.

On the 24th of April the prisoner sent by the hand of his friend to the Governor and Council, a petition for pardon, under his own hand, on the ground of his entire innocence of the crime of which he had been convicted, and for which he was under sentence of death. All proceedings on this petition before the Executive were suspended in consequence of having received notice from the counsel of the prisoner that they were about to make application to the Supreme Court for a writ of error to be issued in his case, on account of certain alleged irregularities. which had been discovered in the course of the proceedings against him. That application was heard before the full Court and overruled.

In the opinion of the Court upon that application pronounced by the Chief Justice, all the proceedings in the case are declared to be according to established judicial forms and the laws of the Commonwealth.

On the 4th June, and before the question on the writ of error had been settled by the Court, Rev. Dr. Putnam for the prisoner, asked to be permitted to withdraw the petition which had been presented to the Governor and Council, for further consideration. The request was complied with by the Governor and Council, and the petition in a day or two was handed to Dr. Putnam.

On the first day of July, Dr. Putnam placed in the hands of the Governor another petition signed by the prisoner, asking for a commutation of his sentence.

On the second day of July this petition was referred to the Committee on Pardons, and on the same day Dr. Putnam appeared before them and made a statement which he said was authorized by the prisoner, in which the prisoner admitted that he killed Dr. Parkman at the time and place charged against him, but denied that the act was premeditated.

He narrated what the prisoner declared to be the manner of killing, and described minutely the mode and process in which the body of Dr. Parkman was disposed of after death.

The prisoner alleges that the "single blow with a stick of wood two feet long and two inches thick," by which Dr. Parkman was killed, was given by him in a moment when "he was excited to the highest degree of passion," and while Dr. Parkman was speaking and gesticulating in the most violent and menacing manner, thrusting the letter and his fist in his face; that in his fury he seized whatever thing was handiest, and that was a stick of wood, and dealt to him an instantaneous blow, with all the force that passion could give, and that he did not know, nor think, nor care where he should hit him, nor how hard, nor what the effect would be."

Upon this statement and upon the other facts proved upon the trial, Dr. Putnam addressed the Committee at length in an able and impressive argument in favor of commuting the sentence of the Court. A petition from the family of the prisoner was before the Committee, and a large number of other petitions, some for a full pardon and others for a commutation, were in the hands of the Committee.

Most of these petitions were from people, men and women, in other States, and generally placed their petition for a remission or mitigation of the sentence on the ground of the great doubts of the prisoner's guilt. The Committee gave three hearings after the meeting at which Dr. Putnam addressed them, and listened to those who desired to be heard in aid of the prisoner's petition and in support of Dr. Putnam's views.

The Committee on Pardons, consisting of the Lieut. Governor and four other Councillors after a full, careful and patient hearing of all that could be offered by the friends of the prisoner and by others, who were pleased to be heard in his behalf, came to the unanimous opinion that there were no sufficient reasons to justify them in recommending the interposition of executive clemency.

They recommended that the Governor be advised to have the sentence of the law, as pronounced by the Court, carried into effect on the 30th day of August next.

The Council, with but one exception, concurred with the report of the Committee, and advised the Governor to carry out the sentence of the Court as recommended by them.

In carefully and anxiously examining and considering the case, I do not feel authorized by any considerations which have been presented to my mind to set aside the deliberate verdict of the Jury, arrest the solemn decree of the law as pronounced by the highest judicial tribunal of the Commonwealth, and disregard the opinion and advice of the Council.

If the circumstances of the killing as stated by the prisoner are taken to be true, it may be well questioned whether the Executive Council could interfere with the sentence without violating the settled laws of the land.

In his charge to the Jury in this case, the Chief Justice says: "*It is a settled rule that no provocation with words only will justify a mortal blow. Then if upon provoking language the party intentionally revenge himself with a mortal blow, it is unquestionably Murder.*"

The only new fact brought to light as to the killing depends upon the word of the prisoner. It will hardly be pretended by any one that the declaration of a person under sentence of death should be permitted to outweigh the doings of the Court and Jury, and rescue him from the consequences which are to follow their proceedings.

It is candidly stated by Dr. Putnam in his able argument, and by several of the petitions presented in favor of commutation, received since his confession, that standing as he does, the word of the prisoner is entitled to no credit.

If the circumstances disclosed on the trial are relied on to support his statement, the reply is, that those circumstances were urged in his favor before the Jury, and they have decided against him. The facts of this appalling case are before the world, they will hereafter fill one of the gloomiest pages in the record of crime among civilized men.

It is undisputed that on the 23d day of November, 1849, John White Webster, a professor in Harvard University, and in the Medical College in Boston, did at mid-day in his room, in that college, within a few feet of the place where he daily stood and delivered scientific lectures to a large class of young men, with unlawful violence take the life of Dr. George Parkman, a respectable citizen of Boston, who had come to that room at the repeated requests of the prisoner.

That after taking his life, he eviscerated and in a manner most shocking to humanity, mutilated the body of his victim, burning parts of it in a furnace, and depositing other parts of it in different places in the building, where they were found by persons who were seeking after Dr. Parkman.

That after killing him, he robbed his lifeless creditor, by taking from him two notes of hand, signed by himself, to which he had no right, and committed still another crime by making false marks upon those notes, and that a jury of his country empannelled according to law, under the direction of four of the five eminent Judges constituting the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, after a long, patient, and impartial trial, and after hearing in his defence the argument of learned and eloquent counsel, upon their oaths, found him guilty of murder.

Upon that verdict, the Court pronounced the awful sentence of death. In such a case there should be obvious and conclusive reasons to authorize the pardoning power to interpose and arrest the sword of Justice. I do not see these reasons.

The combined circumstances of the case force me to the conclusion, that the safety of the community, the inviolability of the law, and the principles of impartial justice demand the execution of the sentence.

I hope it is not necessary for me to say that it would have given me unspeakable pleasure to come to a different result, and that I would do anything on earth in my power, short of violating duty, to alleviate the suffering of a crushed and broken-hearted family.

GEORGE N. BRIGGS.

Council Chamber, *19th July*, 1850.

The *Traveller* also gives the following, relative to the statements of Dr Jarvis before the Council:

Our readers are aware that some statements were made by Dr. Jarvis, before the Executive Council, as to a conversation between him and Dr. S. Parkman, touching the health of Dr. George Parkman previous to his being murdered. The statements were denied by Dr. S. Parkman, in a note, which was published in our columns. In the communication below, submitted to the Council yesterday, it will be seen that Dr. Jarvis acknowledges himself to have been mistaken in attributing to Dr, Parkman the opinions which he did. We publish this communication, as requested, and as necessary, perhaps, to a just view of the matter. The statement of Dr. Jarvis, if correct, had not the slightest bearing upon the question before the Council, but the fact that it is shown, and now admitted to be erroneous, is a striking comment upon the extraordinary latitude which has been given to this extra-judicial investigation. If Dr. Jarvis's statement had been material to the issue of the investigation, and such as would have influenced the decision of the Council, it is obvious that it would have been unjust in its effect, inasmuch as there would have been no opportunity to correct, except through a medium which the rules of the Council would not have recognized—the "hearing," so called, being limited to testimony upon one side of the case. The investigation, or "hearing," therefore, is wholly unmeaning, or it is partial and unjust, and calculated to weaken the force of the law, and to engender a distrust for the established forms of administering justice. There will be no question that the former is the truth, and that this whole examination has been without import, except that it has manifested a remarkable degree of leniency and merciful consideration on the part of the Executive, whose duty, though painful, has been, from the first, as clear as the sunlight.

The *Boston Journal* of Saturday says:

Dr. Webster first learned the decision of the Executive Council, in his case, by reading the report in an evening paper. It is stated that he was but slightly agitated, having as we are informed, prepared himself for the worst. It is further stated upon reliable authority, that he has expressed of late no desire to have his sentence commuted, and that he appears to have a more realizing sense of the awful situation in which he is placed. and also that he is evidently preparing himself for the awful fate which surely awaits him.

Yesterday afternoon Mrs. Webster and family visited him in his cell: They had not then learned the decision of the Government and Council.

High Sheriff Eveleth visited the prisoner this morning, and found him quite calm, exhibiting no observable change in his general appearance.

His Excellency, Gov. Briggs, has affixed his signature to the "Death Warrant," which has been duly transmitted to the High Sheriff.

The family of the prisoner, for a long time past, have studiously avoided reading any newspapers whatever, and hence cannot have been advised from that source of the progress of any matter pertaining to the painful case, in which they are so immediately interested.

The prisoner expressed the hope, this morning, that his family would be kept in ignorance of the day fixed for his execution.

In connection with this case, it may be stated, as a somewhat singular coincidence, that John W. Webster committed the murder on Friday—he was arrested on Friday—the verdict of the Coroner's (secret) Inquest was made public on Friday—one of the regular days selected for his family to visit him at the jail was on Friday—the final decision of the Executive was given on Friday, and his execution is to take place on Friday.

THE CHOLERA.—We regret to learn that the City Inspector has been notified that two cases of cholera have occured in this city during the last week, both of which terminated in death,

HORRIBLE.—In one house on Sycamore street, above the canal, nine persons on Friday night lay sick at the same time with cholera, with none to attend them!—When visited by the health officer on the following morning, five were dead, and the rest dying! The scene is described as horrible. The house was a low, dingy, dark, unventilated and filthy rookery, and seemed a pent up box of every putrefactious odor known, such as would start cholera into life, had cholera never existed. Upon the floor lay a dead man wallowed in filth, upon a bed two others in the sleep of death, with features distorted by the throes of departing life, and in an adjoining room lay two more dead and four dying! The picture is too horrible to dwell upon. The order of the Board of Health was *nine coffins*, and—the story is told—*Cin. Com.*, July 15th.

A telegraphic notice, received this morning from Burlington, Iowa, by the Hon. A. C. Dodge, conveyed to him the afflicting information that yesterday, his sister, Christina, wife of James Clarke, Esq., late governor of the Territory of Iowa, and her eldest son, aged four years, were buried in the same grave, having died the day before of cholera. She was the fifth daughter of the Hon. H. Dodge, of Wisconsin, aged twenty-nine years.—*Washington Union, Friday.*

DAGUERREOTYPE OF THE STAR LYRA.—We had the pleasure, to-day, of looking upon the daguerreotype face of the beautiful star Lyra. It was obtained by Mr. Bond, of the Cambridge Observatory, (aided by Mr. Whipple, the celebrated daguerreotypist, of this city,) at about 11 o'clock on Tuesday night. This is believed to be the first instance in which an attempt to daguerreotype a star has succeeded. The picture of the star is quite distinct, and of the size of a common pin head, and was obtained in about thirty seconds, the great refracting telescope of the observatory being used without the eye-glass. Scientific men will regard this experiment with great interest, as the possible prelude to important astronomical developments.—*Boston Traveller.*

PROGRESS OF THE CHOLERA.—At Nashville, July 13, during the past twenty-four hours, only four deaths had occurred from cholera.

At Louisville, July 14, the deaths during the past week, from cholera, numbered forty-seven.

At Bedford Springs, Ky., four fatal cases of cholera had occurred.

At St. Louis, July 20, the Board of Health reported, for the last twenty-four hours, 39 interments, of which 19 were from cholera.

At Cincinnati, July 20, the Board of Health reported 60 deaths on the 19th, 27 of which were from cholera; and for the past twenty-four hours they reported 59 deaths, 30 of which were from cholera.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL'S OFFICE. SUPPOSED SLAVES.—The ship Martha, recently of New York, but claimed now as belonging to Rio Janeiro, taken possession of by the United States sloop-of-war Perry, off the coast of Africa, and sent to this port, arrived on Wednesday evening at Quarantine. She had on board in all 34 persons, who were taken into custody yesterday, by the United States Marshal and his officers. The Martha was brought in by a Lieut. of the Perry, and a prize crew. Twenty-four of the persons on board, we understand, were brought in irons. Only one of the parties, it is said, (Henry M. Merrill,) is an American; the rest being Spaniards and Portuguese, and none of them acknowledge to have been master or officers; although Henry M. Merrill is supposed to have been so. The Martha, we understand, started from this port about a year ago for California, but put into Rio Janeiro in distress, and was condemned and sold. She was subsequently fitted out for the coast of Africa. Suspicious circumstances connected, it is said, with her movements on the coast, and the fact of her having about 200 hhds. water on board, determined the commander of the Perry to take possession of her as engaged in the slave trade, and to send her to the United States.

CHARACTERISTIC KINDNESS.—Robert Edmond, (who in 1848 was cruelly tarred and feathered, in South Carolina, for endeavoring to teach the slaves to read,) having recently addressed a letter to Gerrit Smith, making known his desire to visit his native land (Scotland,) but lacking the pecuniary means to do so, received in reply the following kind and characteristic response:

PETERBORO, June 16, 1850.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON:

MY DEAR SIR—I have the sheet containing your and Mr. Edmond's letters. My heart tenderly sympathizes with the suffering heart of that outraged brother. I herewith send you for him my draft for $20. I should love to do more for him, but recent disappointments in my pecuniary affairs oblige me to make my gifts smaller. I hope it will not long be so.

What a cruel and wicked—thrice cruel and wicked, land is this in which we live! I rejoice to see that you hold out so strong and true. May the richest blessing of Heaven be upon you and yours!

Your friend and brother,
GERRIT SMITH.

☞We should be glad to see this generous example imitated by others.—*Ed. Lib.*

MARRIAGES.

DENISON—TYLER.—July 11, at Sherwood Forest, Va., by the Rev. W. Seavell, Rev. Henry Mandeville Denison, of Brooklyn, N. Y., to Miss Alice, daughter of ex-president Tyler of the former place.

DEATHS.

BEEKMAN.—In this city, Mr. S. T. Beekman, the Assistant Clerk of the Board of Aldermen.

BALDWIN.—In New Haven, July 16, Mrs. Elizabeth, wife of Hon. Simeon Baldwin, and daughter of the late Hon. Roger Sherman, aged 85.

CABOT.—In Boston, on the 17th instant, George Cabot, aged 35 years.

LOVEL.—On the 10th instant, at the residence of Dr. T. J. Goodwyn, in St. Mathew's Parish, Va., Major James Lovel, aged 92. He was a native of Massachusetts, son of the Hon. James Lovel, of Boston, and born on the 9th of July, 1758.

SILSBEE.—In Salem, July 16, Hon. Nethaniel Silsbee. Mr. Silsbee has been a distinguished and successful merchant, and in the course of his long life has often occupied a seat in each of the branches of the Massachusetts Legislature, and was for one or more years President in the Senate of that Commonwealth. He represented one of the districts of Essex county for four years in Congress, and in 1825 he was chosen to the Senate of the United States.

WIRT.—In Wirtland, near Monticello, Fla., June 26, Dr. Henry Grattan Wirt, youngest son of the late William Wirt, of Maryland.

THE ANNUAL MEETING AT WEST CHESTER.

The Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society will be held on the 16th, 17th and 17th of October, in the Horticultural Hall at West Chester.

THE SEVENTEENTH

National Anti-Slavery Bazaar,

To be held in Boston, commencing on Thursday, the 19th of December, 1850.

It is entirely unnecessary for the undersigned to enlarge upon the importance of this undertaking, the force and solemnity of the motives that have induced them to enter upon and continue it, or the encouraging success that has from year to year crowned the effort.

The patient labor of years has not been in vain.—The strongholds of apathy and indifference, ever the most hopeless, have been stormed and carried. The mind of the whole country is aroused to to its utmost activity, and He who makes the wrath of man praise Him, by the over-ruling of it to the carrying forward of his own gracious purposes, enables us to see, in the changing schemes and cowardly combinations of political parties, the hitherto undreamed of treason of eminent Northern statesmen, the increased confusion, violence, not to say madness, of the Southern slave-masters, those elements of human weakness and passion from which, when conflicting on so grand a scale as at present, evolve the great changes which are the way-marks of History.

Hardly could it occur to the most ignorant and thoughtless mind, that the abolition of American slavery could take place but by an agitation that should convulse the whole nation. The indications that accompany all great changes must be seen here; 'upon the earth, distress of nations with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth.'

Under these circumstances, the clear-toned utterance of *entire and abstract truth* is needed as never before. Amid the clamor of combinations, compromises, propositions and expedients, the trumpet of the Abolitionists should give forth no uncertain sound. As the sole depositories of those truths which alone can save this nation, how deeply should they feel the importance of the position they occupy! It is left to them to declare by words, and by the corresponding actions that alone give words significance, that the distinction between right and wrong is eternal and immutable; that justice, duty, heroism, are verities, whose teachings it is neither safe nor wise to question. Hence follows the simple confession of faith that serves as a cloud and fire through the most pro-slavery wilderness. Slavery is, under all circumstances, a sin; Immediate Emancipation, in all cases, a duty; and according as the sympathies of every man and woman in this great nation are with the slave or master, must each individual character be judged—in the eyes of man *now*, at a higher tribunal hereafter.

To aid in the promulgation of this testimony are the funds of the Bazaar devoted, and for its help we appeal to all, of every class, creed and condition. We feel entitled to the sympathy, and, as far as ability may extend, to the aid of every human creature, inasmuch as it is for their inalienable human right that underlies all others, *the right of personal ownership*, that we are contending.

On this occasion, any impassioned appeal would be superfluous. The motives to exertion reside in the hearts and arouse the consciences of all whose circumstances enable them to co-operate with us, that the success of this year's Bazaar may be in some measure commensurate with the importance of the decisions now at issue.

ANNE WARREN WESTON.
MARY GRAY CHAPMAN.
FRANCES MARY ROBBINS.
ANN GREENE PHILLIPS.
SARAH S. RUSSELL.
SARAH B. SHAW.
LYDIA D. PARKER.
MARY MAY.
SARAH R. MAY
MARIA LOWELL.
EVELINA A. S. SMITH.
HELEN E. GARRISON.
CAROLINE F. WILLIAMS.
THANKFUL SOUTHWICK.
SARAH A. SOUTHWICK.
ABBY B. FRANCIS.
LOUISA LORING.
MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN.
ELIZA LEE FOLLEN.
SUSAN C CABBOT.
CAROLINE WESTON.
CATHERINE SARGENT.
HENRIETTA SARGENT
HANNAH TUFTS.
ANN R. BRAMHALL.
MARY WILLEY.
ELIZABETH GAY.
ELIZA F. EDDY.
HARRIET M. PALMER.
HARRIET B. HALL.

THE FIRST OF AUGUST.
ANNIVERSARY OF EMANCIPATION IN THE WEST INDIA ISLANDS.

The Board of Managers of the MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY having voted that they would celebrate the approaching Anniversary of West India Emancipation by a public meeting in the city of WORCESTER, the Committee of Arrangements would give notice, that the use of the beautiful and spacious CITY HALL of Worcester has been granted for that occasion; and on behalf of the Society, and for the sake of the three million slaves of this country, whose emancipation is still delayed and scornfully refused, they would invite all the true sons and daughters not of Massachusetts alone, but of New England, to assemble on that day in WORCESTER, and renew the demand for that Emancipation in the name of Justice, of Humanity, and of God.

Let early, extensive, and general preparation be made for a meeting which shall surpass all that have gone before.

It should be remembered that Worcester is peculiarly easy of access, by rail-road, not only from other parts of the State, but from Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont; and it is hoped and earnestly desired that a numerous delegation will be present from each of those States.

☞Further particulars hereafter.
For the Committee,
SAMUEL MAY, Jr.

THE ONE HUNDRED CONVENTIONS,
Held pursuant to a resolution adopted at the recent New England Anti-Slavery Convention,
Will continue with meetings at the following named places:

SOUTH HINGHAM, (Plymouth County,)
Sunday July 28.
[This meeting will be held in the Congregational (Unitarian) meeting-house, and is to be attended by PARKER PILLSBURY and N. H. WHITING.]

ANDOVER, (Essex County.)
Saturday Evening and Sunday, July 27 and 28.
[This Convention will be attended on the 28th by WENDELL PHILLIPS, WM. LLOYD GARRISON and PARKER PILLSBURY.]

WORCESTER
Thursday, August 1.

NOTICE.

The Old Colony Anti-Slavery Society will hold a special meeting in the Congregational Church at South Hingham, on Sunday, July 28, 1850. The third session of the meeting will be held at 5 o'clock.

Parker Pillsbury, N. H. Whiting, and others, will be present on the occasion

BOURNE SPOONER, President.
H. H. BRIGHAM, Secretary.

INFORMATION WANTED.

Robert Douglas, recently from Ireland, is anxious to obtain information of the whereabouts of his four brothers, viz: Joseph, James, Andrew and Stewart, who emigrated to the Canadas about five years since from Newtown Crumlin, County of Antrim, Ireland. If alive, they are in Canada or the United States.

Any person who can give information respecting all or any one of the brothers, will do a great kindness by sending notice thereof to Robert Douglas, care of Warren Atwood, Willimantic, Conn.

N. Y. Tribune and *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, please copy. Mr. Douglas is a poor laboring man, and has no money to pay for advertisements; but he is none the less desirous of finding his brothers for that. All other humane papers are solicited to lend a hand.

Papers having exchanges in Canada, especially are requested to notice.

PARKVILLE HYDROPATHIC INSTITUTE (near Woodbury, N. J.) having been recently enlarged can now accommodate a few more patients. Applications for admission to be made to Samuel Webb, Secretary, No. 58 South Fourth street, Philadelphia, where the Resident Physician (Joseph A. Weder, M. D. a pupil of Preissnitz, and who has had much experience in Hydropathy both in this country and in Europe) can be consulted on the Fourth day (Wednesday) of every week, between 12 and 1P. M.

The Prisoners' Friend.

A NEW VOLUME COMMENCED IN SEPTEMBER.

Charles Spear, Editor and Proprietor.

A NEW VOLUME OF THE PRISONERS' FRIEND, commenced in September. Past experience, large observation, and extensive correspondence, both in the Old and New World have given the subscriber facilities possessed by few persons in this country for conducting such a work. The following will comprise the leading features of the work:

I. Valuable original articles on Criminal Reform.
II. A careful selection from the best foreign periodicals.
III. Reviews of valuable works on different moral topics.
IV. List of New Publications.
V. Public Education.
VI. Moral Tales, illustrating the effects of kindness.
VII. Biographical Sketches of eminent philanthropists.
VIII. A record of the various reforms.

It is also intended to procure ELEGANT ENGRAVINGS.
Several valuable writers will contribute to its columns.

I. This is the only paper in the world devoted to the Claims of the Criminal.
II. Its columns are open for Free Discussion.
III. It has no advertising patronage.
IV. It has some of the ablest contributors in this country.
V. It gives a faithful view of the Prison-Reform.

The times now demand a thorough work on the great subjects on which the periodical treats. Such a work having now been started it remains for the friends of the cause to see that it is sustained.

Send your name. If you cannot act, then ask your friend, male or female.

Two dollars a year, in advance. Three copies for $5. Each number to contain 48 pages, making a volume of 576 pages yearly. A title page and index will be added. It will be published in an octavo form, on good paper and fair type. Subscriptions received at the Prisoner's Friend Office, 25 Cornhill, Boston, and at this office.

Miscellany.

We copy from the *Literary World* this review of a recent essay 'on the Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors in Health and Disease,' by Dr. Carpenter, who is already known to our readers, through the extracts of his writings which we have heretofore made from the *London Inquirer*.

THE USE OF ALCOHOL.

On the Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors in Health and Disease. Prize Essay. By William B. Carpenter, M. D., F. R. S., F. G. S., Examiner in the University of London, Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in University College, and Author of Principles of Human Physiology, etc Lea & Blanchard.

We have given the title entire, that it may be seen that the distinguished author is no quack or individual seeking, by a treatise on a popular topic, to bring himself into undeserved notoriety. The work was written in consequence of a one hundred guineas' prize being offered for the best essay on this topic. This is the successful production. As it is calmly and temperately written, and probably most of the real arguments (except the moral ones) against the use of alcoholic beverages are plainly given, we propose, in a condensed form, to present them to our readers, directing them to the work itself for particulars.

What are the effects, corporal and mental, of alcoholic liquors on the healthy system?

"We shall commence," says Dr. Carpenter, "by examining the influence of alcohol upon the *physical*, *chemical* and *vital* properties of the several components of the animal fabric. . . The most important *physical* change which the contact of alcohol effects in the softer animal tissues, is that of *corrugation*, . . . or a skrinking of the animal substance; the chemical change is the coagulation of soluble albumen. Alcohol applied to the living skin produces irritation, inflammation, and death."

Intoxication (as its etymology denotes) is poisoning. A single moderate draught of alcoholic beverages excites the pulse; the appetite and digestive powers are increased, and the secretions of the skin and kidneys augmented. The mind is also enlivened, and the natural qualities made manifest. Another dose, and the voluntary control of the thoughts and muscles is completely destroyed. The third state is one of *coma*, which differs little from apploplexy, and not unfrequently is followed by death.

The rapidity with which alcohol enters into the circulation is remarkable. It could scarcely be more rapid were it injected into the veins. "In one of Dr Percy's experiment, the animal fell lifeless to the ground immediately that the injection of alcohol into the stomach was completed (the respiratory movements and pulsations of the heart entirely ceasing within two minutes), the stomach was found nearly void, whilst the blood was strongly impregnated with alcohol" Alcohol seems to possess a natural affinity for the brain, and the blood in this organ is found to contain a larger proportion of alcohol than that in other parts of the system.

Nature soon carries off the poison, and leaves only the disordered condition it has produced. The skin and kidneys emit large quantities, the lungs exhale it, and still more is carried off by its combustion in the blood, changing it, by combining with oxygen, into carbonic acid and water, which are speedily exhaled by the lungs.

The remote results of the excessive use of alcoholic liquors are Delirium Tremens and Insanity. In ninety-eight asylums in England and Wales, of 12,007 cases, 15 per cent. were from Intemperance In the Glasgow Lunatic Asylum, at least one fourth. In nine provincial asylums, the proportion was 32 62 per cent. In an asylum in the East Indies, the per centage was 41.07. At the Richmond Hospital, Dublin, one half owed their madness to drinking.

Another common form of insanity is called Oinomania: "it is the irresistible propensity to swallow stimulants in enormous doses whenever and wherever they can be procured. . . . The poor victim derives no pleasure from the taste, for he gulps down the liquor, of whatever kind it be; or from society, for he generally avoids it; but he only derives a temporary satisfaction from the gratification of an insane impulse." This disease is what many possess who seem compelled by some demon, at periodical intervals, to "go on a spree," as it is here commonly expressed. It is seldom cured; even after years of confinement, this disease returns with a power the poor victim cannot restrain.

The mental debility of the offspring is one of the most painful consequences of this vice—Idiocy, Insanity, and Mental Debility. Plutarch long ago said, "one drunkard begets another;" and Aristotle's remark has come down to us, that "drunken women bring forth children like unto themselves." In the Report on Idiocy, by Dr. Howe, to the Legislature of Massachusetts, he says: "The habits of the parents of 300 idiots were learned; and 145. or nearly half, were known to be habitual drunkards The parents of No. 62 were drunkards, and had seven idiotic children." Paralysis and epilepsy are also frequently caused by liquor.

Besides these, there are many diseases directly originating from the constant and excessive use of alcoholic drinks. Among many others, these are enumerated: irritation and inflammation of the mucous membrane of the stomach and intestines; dyspepsia, and various diseases of the liver, some forms of which are known as the "drunkard's liver," many affections of the kidneys, &c. Every one has observed, probably, the tendency to diseases of the skin, which is more or less manifest among all frequent drinkers. The liability to epidemic diseases is made manifest, and the causes of spontaneous combustion, which many think improbable, are also given.

A note, under the head of "Diminished power of sustaining injuries by disease or accident," gives this anecdote, showing the enormous powers both of strength and endurance to which man can, by long and severe training, be raised. It is a statement made by one of the coal-heavers employed on the Thames "I was a strict tee-totaler for many years, and I wish I could be so now. All that time I was a coal-whipper, at the heaviest work, and I have made one of a gang that has done as much as 180 tons in a day. I drank no fermented liquors the whole time. I had only ginger beer and milk, and that cost me 1s. 6d. It was in the summer time. I didn't huff it that day; that is, I didn't take my shirt off. Did this work at Regent's Canal, and there was a little milk-shop close on shore, and I used to run there when I was dry. I had about two quarts of milk and five bottles of beer, or about three quarts of fluid altogether. I found that amount of drink necessary. I perspired very violently; my shirt was wet through, and my flannels wringing wet with the perspiration over the work. The rule among us is, that we do 28 tons on deck, and 28 tons filling in the hold. We go on that way during the day. The perspiration in the summer streams down our foreheads so rapidly that it will often get into our eyes before we have time to wipe it off. This makes them very sore. The perspiration is of a very briny nature. We are often so heated over our work that the perspiration runs into our shoes; and often, from the dust and heat, jumping up and down, and the feet being galled with the dust, I have had my shoes filled with blood. The thirst produced by the work is very excessive. It is completely as if you had a fever on you. The dust gets into the throat, and nearly suffocates. You can scrape the coal-dust off the tongue with the teeth; and do what you will, it is impossible to get the least spittle into the mouth. I have known the coal-dust to be that thick in the hold of a ship, that I have been unable to see my mate, though only two feet from me. Your legs totter under you. Both before and after I was a tee-totaler, I was one of the strongest men in the business. I was able to carry 7 cwt. on my back for fifty yards, and I could lift nine half hundreds with my right arm. After finishing my day's work, I was like a child for weakness. . . . Then there's the coal to be carried up a nasty ladder twenty feet—and a sack full of coals weighs two cwts. and a stone, at least; the sack itself heavy and thick. Isn't that a strain on a man? No horse could stand it long The sweat runs into the boots, and I have felt it run down me for hours as I had to trudge along."

Another says: "It is food only that can give real strength to the frame. . . . I have backed 60 tons in a day since I took the pledge, and have done it without any intoxicating drink, with perfect ease to myself, and walked five miles to a temperance meeting afterwards. . . . Coal-backing from the ship's hold is the hardest work that man can do. Going up a ladder sixteen feet high, with 230 lbs. weight on a man's back, is sufficient to kill any one; indeed it does kill the men in a few years; they're soon old men at that work." Surely, on reading such statements, we must exclaim, "there were giants in those days!" And this incredible labor is done better and easier without the use of alcohol! What labor then requires it? It is pitiful to think that these men, so powerful in other respects, are prostrated by the slightest attack of disease; surgeons shrink from trivial operations upon these bulky and strong men, with constitutions destroyed by liquor.

Statistics of Insurance Companies, Army Reports, and Hospital Accounts, prove the fact that the duration of life is much shortened by the excessive use of liquors, with the important corollary—"Intemperance is the chief cause of crime." In answer to the serious question, "Does Physiology or Experience teach us that Alcoholic liquors should form part of the ordinary sustenance of men, particularly under circumstances of exposure to severe labor or extremities of temperature?" theory is given to prove the negative, and facts from actual experience of shipwrecked sailors, those who have wintered in Greenland, and been exposed to the heats of Africa, that such drinks are plainly deleterious. Neither is any more necessary for the fatigues consequent upon mental exertion. "It is the testimony of general experience, that when men of genius have habitually had recourse to alcoholic stimulants for the excitement of their powers, they have died at an early age, as if in consequence of the premature exhaustion of their nervous energy; Mozart, Burns, and Byron (Lamb and Goldsmith), may be cited as remarkable examples of this result." We might easily enlarge the list by additions from this country. Practised Gamblers are remarked, when about to engage in contests requiring sagacious calculations, to "keep themselves cool." The greatest part of that intellectual labor that has extended the domain of human knowledge, has been performed by water drinkers. "Under this last category are enumerated Demosthenes and Haller. Dr. Johnson, in the latter part of his life, took nothing stronger than tea, whilst Voltaire and Fontenelle used coffee; and Newton and Hobbes were accustomed to solace, not to excite themselves, with the fumes of tobacco. In regard to Locke, whose long life was devoted to constant intellectual labor, 'his diet was the same as other people's, except that he usually drank nothing but water.'" As an assistant to endurance of cold, the proof is conclusive that it is injurious. When the stomach is empty, liquor is better than nothing. Food, especially of an oleaginous nature, is best. The reaction of the system after the effect of the drink is over, is especially pernicious. This is proved by the experience of Arctic voyagers, the hunters of Chamouni, and many others leading exposed lives. "In 1619, the crew of a Danish ship of 60 men, well supplied with provisions and ardent spirits, attempted to pass the winter at Hudson's Bay; but 58 of them died before spring; while in the case of an English crew of 52 men, in the same circumstances, but destitute of distilled spirit, only two died!" Many other similar cases are given. As an aid to endurance of heat, and that it is necessary to support the system under the excessive loss by perspiration, at high temperatures, it seems to be thought because water is drawn off from the blood through the pores of the skin, alcohol must be taken in to replace it—a most egregrious absurdity.

* Experience shows that sweating is not exhausting in itself, for the same fatigue is experienced when the atmosphere is loaded with dampness, even at a low temperature. A person clothed in waterproof garments experiences the same unpleasant results from the interference with the customary insensible perspiration. The following characteristic Address of Sir Chas. Napier to the 96th Regiment in Calcutta, May, 1849, sums up whole tables of army reports, and condenses the experience of thousands: "Let me give you a bit of advice—that is, don't drink. I know young men don't think much of advice from old men. They put their tongue in their cheek, and think they know a great deal better than the old cove that is giving them advice. But let me tell you that you are coming to a country where, if you drink, you are dead men. If you be sober and steady, you will get on well; but if you drink, you are done for. You will either be invalided or die. I knew two regiments in this country; one drank, the other didn't. The one that didn't drink is one of the finest regiments, and has got on as well as any regiment in existence. The one that did drink has been all but destroyed. For any regiment for which I have any respect (and there is not one of the British regiments that I don't respect), I should always try and persuade them to keep from drinking. I know there are some men who will drink in spite of the devil, and their officers; but such men will soon be in the hospital, and very few that go in, in this country, ever come out again." The resistance to Morbific Agencies is, also, less with the spirit taker: the Cholera and other pestilential diseases which are known to first attack the drinker, is proof of this.

The consequences of the habitual "moderate" use of alcoholic liquors are quite extensive. As a stimulant to the stomach, it over-excites it, which, besides weakening that organ by too much use, has a tendency to produce a general state of plethora, which is favorable to local congestions, and inflammatory diseases of various organs, and which especially disposes to hemorrhages and the diseases of the liver. The effect on the nervous system, and on nutrition, have previously been briefly noticed; and in a synopsis like this, the difference between the effects of excessive and moderate drinking are too slight to be delineated. They differ mostly in amount. The effects on nutrition are most marked. A slight cut in a healthy water drinker, if the incised edges be placed together, will usually unite as it were, and the wound be entirely healed in a few days. No such action takes place in similar injuries of the drinker. The wound becomes a "sore," and goes through a tedious process of suppuration before health is restored to the part. Many people who complain that "their flesh does not heal quick," perhaps do not think that this habit is frequently the (for it is not the only) cause.

"Are there any special modifications of the bodily or mental condition of man, short of actual disease, in which the occasional or habitual use of Alcoholic Liquors may be necessary or beneficial?'

In the demand for extraordinary bodily exertion, the author allows that in cases which resemble the efforts of a race-horse, the spur may be used if absolutely necessary; but it is necessary to remember, that the spur gives no strength in advance to the laboring sailor or the exhausted orator, but calls out the vigorous exercise of the remaining strength The racer may fall dead at the winning-post, and the over exertion of the vital powers must ultimately tell upon the fabric. Alcoholic beverages may be advantageous to resist the influences of temporary exposures to damp and wet (as in the case of a traveller on the top of a coach), but where the exposure is daily or long-continued, the result of its use is unquestionably injurious. Where there is a deficiency of adequate sustenance, as in the case of the Mutiny of the Bounty, a teaspoonful of rum given to each man by Capt. Bligh, every morning, was undoubtedly of great utility. In some cases of deficiency of constitutional vigor it is not uncommonly of use, but the great number might take up with Abernethy's advice, "Live on a shilling a day and earn it." Liquor will not supply the place of proper food, pure air, and sufficient exercise. In cases of Pregnancy, there are states of irritability of the stomach where distilled or fermented drinks are useful; but both in this and in Lactation, care should be taken not to substitute a beverage for a medicine. "The regular administration of alcohol, with the professed object of supporting the system under the demand occasioned by the flow of milk, is 'a mockery, a delusion, and a snare.'" For alcohol affords no single element of the secretion, and is more likely to impair than to improve the quality of the milk; and still more, the milk secreted by such stimulation is so modified in its character, that it is not unfrequently unfit nourishment for the child. "The only cases," says Dr. Macnish, "in which a moderate portion of malt liquor is justifiable, are when the milk is deficient, and the nurse unable or averse to putting another in her place."

(The writer of this synopsis, in the year 1848, made a series of examinations of the various kinds of cows' milk generally found in this city. In that produced by the cows fed on "distillery slop," the refuse after distillation, the "epithelial scales," or the small glands in which the milk is formed, were found to have been cast off from the secreting membranes of the udder, and were in a highly inflamed and diseased state. Such milk given to delicate children produced almost immediately vomiting, purging, &c., although in usual health before, and living on ordinary grass-fed milk. Perhaps the milk of women is similarly affected by similar drinks?)

In childhood it is supposed that the habitual use of fermented drinks is advantageous, especially in those that inherit a scrofulous diathesis. Cold water, sea bathing, exercise, and air, are far better. If they are to be used at all, they should resemble splints for a broken leg, to be removed as speedily as possible, so that nature may not be accustomed to rely upon them for support.

In old age its use is far less frequent than is generally supposed. As the waste of the body is far less than in youth, a proportionably less quantity of food is necessary to support life. The stimulation of the old, unaccustomed to these incentives, is most likely to effect a loss of digestive power, which no treatment, medical or hygienic, can ever completely repair.

"Is the employment of Alcoholic Liquors necessary in the practice of Medicine; if so, in what diseases, or in what forms and stages of disease, is the use of them necessary or beneficial?"

This is not denied by the author, but it must be administered with more care than is generally considered useful. After a *severe blow*, which has apparently almost overthrown the powers of life, and more particularly when the brain is the part to which the injury has occurred, on account of the special determination of blood to this organ; after extensive burns; these stimulants are manifestly beneficial in maintaining the heart's action, and keeping up the nervous excitability.

In the treatment of acute diseases, where the shock is temporary, in some stages of fever, erysipelas, &c., in the recovery from prostration when the vital powers are not so much exhausted as depressed, in these and other forms of acute diseases, alcohol is useful. In chronic diseases but little good can be expected from its administration. Its use is like raising the wick when there is a deficiency of oil; since it is procured not by the re-animation of power which exists in the body but has previously lain dormant, but by the rapid consumption of "the small stock of power left."

We have given this work a thorough digest, and endeavored to state the views of the author clearly and fully. The author may seem to be somewhat of an enthusiast on the subject, and has, without doubt, stated all that may be said in relation to the physical effects of alcohol on the human system. We might not, perhaps, agree with every statement therein contained, but we consider it questionable if it would be profitable at the present time to go into any extended examination of them. In the main he is undoubtedly correct, and if he errs does it on the safe side.

THE CATTLE-ROAD TO RUIN.

There is more animal food consumed in England than in any other country in the world. We do not merely say more, in proportion to the size of England, and the numbers of its inhabitants—for then we should only utter what every body must know—but we mean actually *more*, without any such proportional considerations. Considering, then, this vast amount of animal food, in all its manifold bearings, it is impossible not to be struck with a sense of what vital importance it is to the health and general well-being of the community that this food should be of a perfectly wholesome kind. That very great quantities are not only unwholesome, but of the worst and most injurious kind, we shall now proceed to show. We will set this question clearly before the eyes of the reader, by tracing the brief and eventful history of an ox, from his journey to Smithfield, till he rolls his large eye upward for the last time beneath the unskilful blows of his slaughterer.

A good-natured, healthy, honest-faced ox, is driven out of his meadow at break of day, and finds a number of other oxen collected together in the high road, amidst the shouting and whistling of drovers, the lowing of many deep voices, and the sound of many cudgels. As soon as the expected numbers have all arrived from the different stalls and fields, the journey of twenty miles to the railway commences. Some are refractory—the thrusting and digging of the goad instantly produces an uproar, and even our good-natured ox cannot help contributing his share of lowing and bellowing, in consequence of one of these poignant digs received at random while he was endeavouring to understand what was required of him. From this moment there is no peace or rest in his life. The noise and contest is nearly over after a few miles, though renewed now and then at a cross-road, when the creatures do not know which way they are to go, and some very naturally go one way, and some the other. The contest is also renewed whenever they pass a pond, or brook, as the weather is sultry; and the roads are so dusty, besides the steam from the breath and bodies of the animals, that their journey seems to be through a dense, continuous, stifling cloud. It is noon; and the sun is glaring fiercely down upon the drove. They have as yet proceeded only twelve miles of their journey, but the sleek and healthy skin of our honest-faced ox has already undergone a considerable change—and as for his countenance, it is waxing wroth. His eye has become blood-shot since they passed the last village alehouse, where he made an attempt, in passing, just to draw his feverish tongue along the water of the horse-trough, but was suddenly prevented by a violent blow of the hard nob-end of a drover's stick across the tip of his nose. Besides this, the wound he has received from the goad, has laid bare the skin on his back, and the sun is beginning to act upon this, as well as the flies. By the time the twenty miles are accomplished, he is in no mood at all for the close jam in which he is packed with a number of others in one of the railway cattle-waggons. He bellows aloud his pain and indignation; in which sonorous eloquence he is joined by a bullock at his side, who has lost half one horn by a violent blow from a drover's stick, because he had stopped to drink from a ditch at the road-side, and persisted in getting a taste. Our ox makes the acquaintance of this suffering individual, and they recount their wrongs to each other; but the idea of escape does not occur to them; they rather resign themselves to endure their destiny with stolidity, if possible Hunger, however, and worse than this, thirst, causes sensations which are quite beyond all patient endurance; and again they uplift their great voices in anger and distress.

Our rather slow-minded ox has now arrived at the opinion that some mischief is deliberately intended him, and feels convinced that something more is needed in this world than passive submission. But what to do, he knows not. His courage is high—only he does not comprehend his position. Man, and his doings, are a dreadful puzzle to him. His one-horned friend fully coincides in all this. Meantime, they are foaming with heat, and thirst, and fever.

After a day's torture in this way, the animals are got out of the waggon, by a thrashing process which brings them pell-mell over each other, many landing on their knees, some head foremost, and one or two falling prostrate beneath the hoofs of the rest

The journey to London then commences, the two friends having been separated in the recent confusion.

With the dreadful scenes, among the live cattle, which regularly take place in Smithfield market our readers have already been made acquainted; it will now be our duty to display before them several equally revolting, and, though in a different way still more alarming, scenes and doings which occur in this neighborhood, and in other markets and their vicinities.

Look at this ox, with dripping flanks, half covered with mud; a horrid wound across his nose; the flesh laid bare in a rent on his back, and festering from exposure to the sun and the flies; his eye-balls rolling fiercely about, and clots of foam dropping from his mouth! Would any one believe that three days ago he was a good-natured, healthy, honest-faced ox? He is waiting to be sold. But who will give a decent price for a poor beast in this unsound condition? He is waiting with a cord round his neck, by which he is fastened to a rail, and in his anguish he has drawn it so tight that he is half-strangled; but he does not care now. He can endure no more, he thinks, because he is becoming insensible. Presently, among several others brought to the same rail, he recognizes his friend with the broken horn. They get side by side, and gasp deeply their mutual torments. There are no more loud lowings and bellowing; they utter nothing but gasps and groans. Besides the fractured horn, this bullock has since received a thrust from a goad in his right eye, by which the sight is not only destroyed, but an effect produced which makes it requisite to sell him at any price he will bring This being agreed upon, he is led away to a slaughter-house near at hand. Our poor ox makes a strong effort to accompany his friend, and with his eye-balls almost starting from his head, tugs at the cord that holds him by the throat, until it breaks. He then hastens after the other, but is quickly intercepted by a couple of drovers, who assail him with such fury, that he tears about, and runs out of the market.

He is in too wretched and worn-out a condition to run fast, so he merely staggers onward amidst the blows, till suddenly a water-cart happens to pass. The sight of the shining drops of water seems to give the poor beast a momentary energy. He runs staggering at it head-foremost—his eyes half shot,—falls with his head against the after-part of the wheel as the cart passes on,—and there lies lolling out his tongue upon the moistened stones. He makes no effort to rise. The drovers form a circle round him, and rain blows all over him; but the ox still lies with his tongue out upon the cool wet stones. They then wrench his tail round till they break it and practise other cruelties upon him; but all in vain. There he lies.

While the drovers are pausing to wipe their sanguinary and demoniac foreheads, and recover their breath, the ox slowly, and as if in a sort of delirium, raises himself on his legs, and stands looking at the drovers with forlorn vacancy. At this juncture the Market Inspector joins the crowd, and after a brief glance at the various sores and injuries, condemns the ox as diseased—therefore unfit for sale. He is accordingly led off, limping and stumbling to the horse-slaughterer's in Sharp's Alley, duly attended by the Inspector, to see that his order of condemnation be carried into effect. They are followed at a little distance by two fellows, whose filthy habiliments show that they have slept amidst horrors who keep the diseased ox in view with a sort of stealthy wolfish "eye to business"

The dying ox, with the drover, and the Inspector, having slowly made their way through the usual market difficulties, and (to those who are not used to it) the equally revolting horrors of the outskirts, finally get into Sharp's Alley, and enter the terrific den of the licensed horse-slaughter-house.

It is a large knacker's yard, furnished with all the usual apparatus for slaughtering diseased or worn-out horses, and plentifully bestrewn with the reeking members and frightful refuse of the morning's work. But even before the eye,—usually the first and quickest organ in action,—has time to glance round, the sense of smell is not only assailed, but taken by storm, with a most horrible, warm, moist, effluvium, so offensive, and at the same time so peculiar and potent, that it requires no small resolution in any one, not accustomed to it, to remain a minute within its precincts. Three of the corners are completely filled up with a heap of dead horses lying upon their backs, with their hoofs sticking bolt upright; while two other angles in the yard are filled with a mass of bodies and fragments, whose projecting legs and other members serve as stretchers for raw skins.—flayed from their companions, or from themselves, lying all discoloured, yet in all colors, beneath. By this means the skins are stretched out to dry. A few live animals are in the yard. There is one horse—waiting for his turn—as the ox-party come in; his knees are bent, his head is bowed towards the slushy ground, his dripping mane falling over his face, and almost reaching with its lank end to the dark muddled gore in which his fore hoofs are planted. A strange, ghastly, rattling sound, apparently from the adjoining premises, is kept up without intermission; a sort of inconceivably rapid devil's-tattoo, by way of accompaniment to the hideous scene.

Two dead horses are being skinned; but all the other animals—of the four-footed class we mean—are bullocks in different stages of disease, and they are seven in number. These latter have not been condemned by the Inspector, but have been brought here to undergo a last effort for the purpose of being made saleable—washed and scrubbed, so as to have the chance of finding a purchaser by torchlight at some very low price; and failing in this, to be killed before they die, or cut up as soon after they die as possible. They are all distinguished by slang terms according to the nature and stage of their diseases. The two best of these bad bullocks are designated as "choppers;" the three next, whose hides are torn in several places, are called "rough-uns;" while those who are in a drooping and reeking condition, with literally a death-sweat all over them are playfully called "wet-uns." To this latter class belongs our poor ox, who is now brought in, and formally introduced by the Inspector, as diseased, and *condemned*. The others he does not see—or, at least, does not notice—his business being with the ox, who was the last comer. Having thus performed his duty the Inspector retires!

But what *is* this ceaseless rattling tatoo that is kept up in the adjoining premises? The walls vibrate with it! Machinery of some kind? Yes—it is a chopping machine; and here you behold the "choppers," both horses and diseased bullocks, who will shortly be in a fit state for promotion, and will then be taken piece-meal next door. Ay, it is so, in sober and dreadful seriousness. Here in this Sharp's Alley, you behold the largest horse-slaughter-house in the city; and here, next door, you will find the largest sausage manufactory in London. The two establishments thus conveniently situated, belong to near relations—brothers, we believe, or brothers-in-law.

Now, while the best of the diseased bullocks or "choppers" are taken to the sausage machine, to be advantageously mixed with the choppings of horse-flesh (to which latter ingredient the angry redness of so many "cured" sausages, *saveloys*, and all the class of *polonies* is attributable), who shall venture to deny that, in the callousness of old habits, and the boldness derived from utter impunity and profitable success, a very considerable addition is often made to the stock of the "choppers," from many of the "rough-uns," and from of the more sound parts of the miserable "wet-uns" Verily this thing may be—"'tis apt, and of great credit," to the City of London.

But a few words must be said of the "closing scene" of our poor condemned ox. We would, most willingly, have passed this over, leaving it to the imagination of the reader; but as no imagination at all would be likely to approach the fact, we hope we shall be rendering a service to common humanity in doing some violence to our own, and the reader's feelings, by exposing such scenes to the gaze of day.

Owing to some press of business, the ox was driven to a neighboring slaughter-house in the Alley.—He was led to the fatal spot, sufficiently indicated, even amidst all the rest of the sanguinary floor, by its frightful condition. They placed him in the usual way; the slaughterman approached with his pole-axe, and swinging it round in a half-jocose and reckless manner, to hide his want of practice and skill, he struck the ox a blow on one side of his head, which only made him sink with a groan on his knees, and sway over on one side. In this attitude he lay groaning while a torrent of blood gushed out of his mouth, He could not be made to rise again to receive the stroke of death or further torment.—They kicked him with the utmost violence in the ribs and on the cheek with their iron-nailed shoes, but to no purpose. They then jumped upon him; he only continued to groan. They wrenched his already-broken tail till they broke it again, higher up, in two places. He strove to rise, but sank down as before. Finally they had recourse to the following torture: they closed his nostrils with wet cloths held tightly up by both hands, so that no breath could escape, and they then poured a bucketful of dirty slaughterhouse water into his mouth and down his throat, till with the madness of suffocation the wretched animal was roused to a momentary struggle for life, and with a violent fling of the head, which scattered all his torturers, and all their apparatus of wet rags and buckets, he rose frantically upon his legs. The same slaughterman now advanced once more with his pole-axe, and dealt a blow, but again missed his mark, striking only the side of the head. A third blow was more deliberately levelled at him, and this the ox, by an instinct of nature, evaded by a side movement as the axe descended. The slaughterman enraged beyond measure, and yet more so by the jeers of his companions, now repeated his blows in quick succession, not one of which was effective, but only produced a great rising tumour. The elasticity of this tumour which defeated a death-blow, added to the exhaustion of the slaughterman's strength, caused this scene of barbarous butchery to be extended to the utmost, and the groaning and writhing ox did not fall prostrate till he had received as many as fifteen blows. What followed cannot be written.

It is proper to add that scenes like these resulting from want of skill in the slaughterman, are by no means so common in Smithfield, as in some other markets—Whitechapel more especially. But they occur occasionally in an equal or less degree, in every market of the metropolis.

The two haggard, wolf-eyed fellows who had prowled after the ox, and his Inspector, now step forward and purchase the bruised and diseased corpse of the slaughtered (murdered) animal, and carry it away to be sold to the poor, in small lots by gas-light, on Saturday nights, or in the form of soup; and to the rich in the disguise of a well-seasoned German-sausage, or other delicious preserved meat! So much for the inspector, and the amount of duty he so ably performed!

We make the following extract from a pamphlet recently published, entitled, "An Enquiry into the present state of the Smithfield Cattle Market, and the Dead Meat Markets of the Metropolis:"

"The *wet-uns* are very far gone in disease, and are so bad that those who have to touch them, carefully cover their hands to avoid immediate contact with such foul substances, naturally fearing the communication of poison. A servant of a respectable master butcher, about a twelvemonth ago, slightly scratched his finger with a bone of one of these diseased animals; the consequence was he was obliged to go to the hospital, where he was for upwards of six weeks, and the surgeons all agreed that it was occasioned by the poison from the diseased bone. It is also a fact, that if the hands at any time come in contact with this meat, they are frequently so affected by the strong smell of the medicine which has been given to the animal when alive, that it is impossible for a considerable time to get rid of it; and yet, it will scarcely be believed, none of these poisonous substances are thrown away—all goes in some shape or form into the craving stomachs of the hungry poor, or is served up as a dainty for the higher classes. Even cows which die in calving, and still-born calves, are all brought to market and sold.—Let these facts be gainsayed; we defy contradiction."

We must by no means overlook the adventures and sufferings of sheep; nor the unwholesome condition to which great numbers of them are reduced before they are sold as human food.

A sheep is scudding and bouncing over a common, in the morning, with the dew glistening on her fleece. She is full of enjoyment, and knows no care in life. In the evening of the same day she is slowly moving along a muddy lane, among a large flock; fatigued, her wool matted with dust and slush, her mouth parched with thirst, one ear torn to a red rag by the dog. He was sent to do it by the shepherd, because she lagged a little behind, to gaze through a gap in the hedge at a duck-pond in the field. She has been in a constant state of fright confusion, and apprehension, ever since. At every shout of the shepherd's voice, or that of his boy, and at every bark of the dog, or sound of the rapid pattering of his feet as he rushes by, she has expected to be again seized, and perhaps torn to pieces. As for the passage or the dog over her back, in one of his rushes along the backs of the flock, as they huddle densely together near some crooked corner or cross-way—in utter confusion as to what they are wanted to do—what they themselves want to do—what is best to do—or what in the world is about to be done—no word of man, or bleat of sheep, can convey any adequate impression of the fright it causes her. On one of these occasions when going through a narrow turnpike, the dog is sent over their backs to worry the leaders who are going the wrong way, and in her spring forward to escape the touch of his devilish foot, she lacerated her side against a nail in the gate post, making a long wound.

The sudden pain of this causes her to leap out of the rank, up a bank; and seeing a green field beneath, the instinct of nature makes her leap down, and scour away. In a moment, the dog—the fury—is after her. She puts forth all her strength, all her speed—the wind is filled with the horrors of his voice—of the redoubling sound of his feet—he gains upon her—she springs aside—leaps up banks—over hurdles—through hedges—but he is close upon her;—without knowing it she has made a circle, and is again nearing the flock, which she reaches just as he springs upon her shoulders and tears her again on the head, and his teeth lacerate anew her coagulated ear. She eventually arrives at the railway station, and is crushed into one of the market waggons; and in this state of exhaustion, fever, and burning thirst, remains for several hours, until she arrives in the suburbs of Smithfield. What she suffers in this place has been narrated, till finally she is sold, and driven off to be slaughtered. The den where this last horror is perpetrated (for in what other terms can we designate all these unnecessary brutalities?) is usually a dark and loathsome cellar. A slanting board is sometimes placed, down which the sheep are forced. But very often there are no such means of descent, and our poor jaded, footsore, wounded sheep—all foul and fevered, and no longer fit food for man—is seized in the half-naked blood boltered arms of a fellow in a greasy red nightcap, and flung down the cellar, both her fore-legs being broken by the fall. She is instantly clutched by the ruffians below—dragged to a broad and dripping bench—flung upon it, on her back—and then the pallid face and patient eye looks upward!—and is understood.

And shall not we also—the denizens of a Christian land—understand it? Shall we not say—"Yes poor victim of man's necessities of food, we know that your death is one of the means whereby we continue to exist—one of the means whereby our generations roll onward in their course to some higher states of knowledge and civilization—one of the means whereby we gain time to fill, to expand and to refine the soul, and thus to make it more fitting for its future abode. But, knowing this, we yet must recognize in you a fellow-creature of the earth, dwelling in our sight, and often close at our side, and trusting us—a creature ever harmless, and ever useful to us, both for food and clothing; nor do we deserve the good with which you supply us, nor even the proud name of Man, if we do not at the same time recognize your rightful claim to our humane considerations."

In the course of last year there were sold in Smithfield Market, the enormous number of two hundred and thirty-six thousand cattle; and one million, four hundred and seventeen thousand sheep. A practical authority has curiously calculated the number of serious and extensive bruises, caused by sheer brutality, rather than any accidents, in the course of a year, He finds that the amount could not be less than five hundred and twelve thousand. These are only the body-bruises, and do not include any of the various cruelties of blows and cuts on the nose, hocks, horns, tails, ears, legs, &c. Of course, this fevered and bruised flesh rapidly decomposes, and is no longer fit for human food. The flesh of many an animal out of Smithfield, killed on Monday, has become diseased meat by Tuesday evening—a fact too well known. The loss on brused meat in the year has been calculated, by a practical man, at three shillings a head on every bullock, and sixpence on every sheep, making a total loss of Sixty-Three thousand Pounds per annum. This loss, it is to be understood, is independent of the quantity of bruised and diseased meat, which *ought* to be lost, but is sold at various markets, as human food. It is also independent of the number of diseased calves and pigs brought to market every week, and sold.—Very much of this diseased meat is sold publicly—in Newgate Market, and Tyler's Market more especially—and at any rate there is a special and regular trade carried on in it. One soup establishment, for the working classes, is said to carry on a business amounting to between four and five hundred pounds weekly, in diseased meat. It is also used by sausage, polony, and saveloy makers; for meat pies, and a-la-mode beef shops; and is used extensively by many of the concoctors of preserved meats for home and foreign consumption. It is said that one of the Arctic Expeditions failed, chiefly, in consequence of the preserved meats failing them. They would not keep. Is it any wonder that they would not keep? What they were made of—wholly, or in part—has been sufficiently shown.

"In Newgate Market," says the writer previously quoted, "the most disgraceful trade is carried on in diseased meat; as a proof of which, we assert that one person has been known to purchase from one hundred and twenty, to one hundred and thirty diseased carcases of beasts weekly; and when it is known that there are from twenty to thirty persons, at least, engaged in this nefarious practice in this market alone, some idea may be formed of its extent.

"The numbers of diseased sheep from *variola ovina*, of small pox, sent to this market, are alarmingly on the increase, and it is much to be feared that this complaint is naturalized among our English flocks. It is very much propagated in the metropolis. It is an acknowledged fact that upwards of one hundred sheep in this state were weekly, and for a considerable period, consigned for sale from one owner, who had purchased largely from abroad, and this took place at the early part of the present year (1848), and was one of the causes of the inquiry in Parliament, and the subsequent act.

"An Inspector is appointed to this market with full powers, acting under a deputation from the Lord Mayor; but the duties of the office must be of a very difficult nature, and probably *interfere materially with the other avocations* of the Inspector, as we find but little evidence of his activity. Compare our statement above with the return laid before the Board of Trade, and it will appear that of fifty diseased carcases not one on an average is seized.

"Close adjoining to Newgate Market, is Tyler's Market, it is only separated by Warwick Lane.—This market is said to be private property and that no Inspector has ever been appointed. Every description of diseased meat is sold here in the most undisguised manner: it is *celebrated* for *diseased pork*. It has been stated by a practical man, one well acquainted with the facts, and fully capable of forming a correct opinion, that nearly one half of the pigs sold in this market during the pork season of 1847, ending March 1848, was diseased and unfit for human food; and of all other diseased animals, what has been said of Newgate applies with far greater force to this market. In Leadenhall Market diseased meat is also sold, though not to the same extent. Whitechapel Market is situate to the south of the main or high street bearing the above name. It is rather difficult to describe the trade carried on here. The situation of the shops—*long, dark, and narrow*, with the *slaughter houses behind*—is well adapted for carrying on the disgraceful practices in either a wholesale or retail manner to a very great extent. Some of the very worst description of diseased animals brought to Smithfield alive are here slaughtered, and large quantities of meat from the country, totally unfit for food, arrive in every stage of disease, and are sold by the pound and stone, to a fearful extent. The following are the names of the other meat markets, to all of which some diseased animals and meat find their way,—and to *none* of them is any Inspector appointed:—

"Clare Market, retail; Newport, wholesale and retail; St. Georges, retail; Oxford, retail; Portman, retail; Brook's, retail; Sheppard's, retail; Boro' retail; Carnaby, retail, Spitalfields, retail: Finsbury, retail. At all of the markets the meat is exposed for sale on Saturday evenings, under the glare of projecting gas burners; and the poor, who receive their wages on that day, and are the principal customers, are deceived by its appearance in this light; their object is of course to obtain the cheapest and the most economical joints; the meat without fat, which is most diseased, is selected by them, being considered the most profitable, though the fact is that this species of meat has been proved to be the cause of cancerous diseases, and diseases of the chest and lungs."

The above was attested by one of the witnesses before the Committee of 1848. To think of these abominations having gone on regularly ever since! Why it looks as though our legislators had received no communication from one of the Inspectors, assuring honorable gentlemen that "it was all nonsense, all this talk about diseased meat! If the meat was now and then a little queer—though *he* had never seen such a thing—none of the poor were any worse for eating it!" But we will answer for one thing; the Inspector never breathed a word about the *preserved meats* which so frequently present themselves with a modest air in purple and white china as delicacies for rich men's tables!

The *foreign stock*, and the circumstances under which they arrive, must not be passed over. They are confined during four or five, or even six days in the dark and stifling hold of the vessel, and it frequently occurs that in all this time there is scarcely any food given them (we are assured, on good authority, that there is often *none*) nor one drop of water. The condition in which they arrive may be conjectured. Besides the extensive preparations for the Monday's market, which are made by the drovers and salesmen of the home stock during Sunday, the desecration of the "day of rest" is immensely increased by the supply of foreign stock, which arrives at the same time. Foreign vessels, (we are quoting from evidence before a Committee) bringing cattle endeavor to arrive here on Sunday as early as possible, in order that the salesman may see the stock before the animals are brought into the market. There is also a very large supply of calves from Holland which are all carted from Blackwall; and the confusion and uproar there, and at Brewer's Quay on a Sunday morning, passes all belief. Great quantities of cattle are also sent on Sunday in order to avoid the expense of *lairage*, or standing room. About two thousand men and boys are employed in this real Sunday desecration. Need we say, it is of the most shocking and cruel nature? *Here* is something really worthy of the storm that is so much wasted on minor matters in this much-vexed question.—*Household Words.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

——Here is nothing I observe and note down with greater precision than the equinoxes—the conjugal equinox, when, after the honeymoon, the sun enters the balance, and the meteorological equinox of nature because from the state of the weather in both at this season I am enabled to prophecy, in a wonderful manner, what it will be for a long period. The most important (to my mind) is the first storm, both in spring and in the married state; all the others come from the same quarter.—*Jean Paul Richter.*

——The Siamese Twins Dead.—The Paris Journal des Debats announces the death, in England, of the famous Siamese Twins. The Debats states, that, according to the *London Medical Times*, the two brothers died of marasmus. A post-mortem examination proved what has been constantly supposed by the faculty, viz that the two cavities of the abdomen communicated by means of the hollow ligament which united them, and that the livers of the twins were connected by a membrane bridle about half an inch thick.

——Arrival of General Garibaldi.—The *Liverpool Albion* announces the arrival in that city of Gen. Garibaldi, the celebrated defender of Rome, by the steamer Queen, from Gibraltar The General looks exceedingly well in health, and appears in excellent spirits. The General will remain in Liverpool for a short time, but he contemplates a visit to America. A Paris letter, written some weeks ago, says, "Garibaldi, the well-known leader of the republican system at Rome, is now residing at Tangiers, in Africa, and he is very busily engaged in writing memoirs upon the great events in which he took such a large part. The manuscript has been sold to a bookseller, of Paris, who will publish it at the same time in the French and Italian languages."

——Folly in 1850.—The *Osservatore Romano* publishes a letter from Fossombrone, of the 1st instant, announcing that another miraculous image of the Virgin has commenced to move its eyes in that town. Except its smaller size, it is the exact copy of that of the Very Reverend Fathers of the most Precious Blood at Riminni, and belongs to a woman called the *Fattora*, to whom it was made a present on her wedding by a monsignor who is not named. It is added that this image began to move its eyes almost at the same time as that of Riminni, and the miracle was first observed in private by the owner and some of her female friends. The bishop Monsignor Ugolini, afterwards got it placed in the Episcopal Chapel. A commission of theologians, named to give its opinion, declared itself satisfied of the fact, and made a favorable report, in consequence of which the statue was transported to the cathedral, where, says the letter, it now cures the halt, the blind, the dumb, and the deaf. Immense sums have already been received for alms by the church on account of this wonderful miracle.

——The Philosophy of Drowning.—Man is the only animal that drowns naturally. He does so because he is endowed with reason—that is to say, with a large spherical brain with a skull on it, which rises above his nose. If he fall into deep water, in spite of his great brain, he has not presence of mind enough to stick his nose out and keep it out, as he easily might do, but his heavy head, like a stone, presses his nose under water. In this position he inhales and fills his chest with water,—so as he becomes on the whole so much heavier than water as to sink. While the lungs are filled with air, the body is lighter than its bulk of water, and of course swims just as an iron vessel does. All, therefore, which is necessary to keep a person from drowning in deep water is to keep the water out of the lungs. Suppose yourself a bottle. Your nose is the nozzle of the bottle, and must be kept out of the water. If it goes under, don't breathe at all till it comes out. Then, to prevent its going down again, keep every other part under—head, legs, arms, all under water but your nose. Do that, and you can't sink in any depth of water. All you need do to secure this is to clasp your hands behind your back, and point your nose at the top of the heavens and kept perfectly still. Your nose will never go under water to the end of time, unless you raise your brain, hand, knee, or foot higher than it. Keep still with your nose turned up in perfect impudence, and you are safe. This will do in tolerably still water; in boisterous water you will need a little of the art of swimming.

——Superstition in France.—The *Courier de Meuse* says:—"Witchcraft is still an object of belief in our provinces. On Sunday, in a village belonging to the arrondissement of Verdun, the keeper of the parish bull forgot to lay before the poor animal at the usual hour its accustomed allowance of provender. The bull, impatient at the delay, made a variety of efforts to gain his liberty, and at last succeeded. The first use he made of his freedom was to demolish a rabbit-hutch which was in the stable. The keeper's wife hearing the noise ran to the place, and as soon as she saw the bull treading mercilessly upon the rabbits with his large hoofs, seized a cudgel and showered down a volley of blows on the crupper of the devastator. But, not being accustomed to this rough treatment, the bull grew angry, and fell upon his neighbors, the oxen, and, with horns and hoofs, turned the stable into a scene of terror and confusion. The woman began to cry for help. Her cries were heard, and with some trouble the bull was ousted from the stable, and forthwith began to butt at everything in his path. The mayor and the adjoint of the commune were attracted to the scene of this riot, and, on witnessing the animal's violence declared, after a short deliberation, that the bull was a sorcerer, or, at any rate, that he was possessed with a devil, and that he ought to be conducted to the presbytery in order to be exorcised. The authorities were accordingly obeyed, and the bull was dragged or driven into the presence of the curate, who was requested to subject him to the formalities prescribed in the ritual. The good priest found no little difficulty in escaping the pressing solicitations of his parishioners. At last, however, he succeeded; but, though the bull escaped exorcism, he could not elude the shambles. Condemned to death by the mayor as a sorcerer, his sentence was immediately executed.