VOL. XIX. NO. 47. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1859. WHOLE NO. 983.

National Anti-Slavery Standard,

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

107 North Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "Editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York."

Letters enclosing the money, and those or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "Publisher of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York."

RATE OF ADVERTISING, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO CHOATE.

DUTY OF MINISTERS TO IGNORE POLITICAL AND GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONFINE THEMSELVES TO THE WORK OF SAVING SOULS!

[Extract from the speech of Hon. RUFUS CHOATE, delivered at the Twenty fifth Anniversary of the Settlement of Nehemiah (Southside) Adams, D.D., over the Street street Church, in Boston.]

But there is another reason, which I, committing nobody, running the risk of suffering from many of you, laymen and clergy, but resuming to act for nobody but myself, with your permission, will provide, if I give, as a reason, why a sober, conscientious and thoughtful layman might well have attended the worship of this Church. And that is, permit me to say, that we have every one of us assented, all, at least, who have been from Sunday to Sunday, and took our seats in our pew, that we should hear nothing in the world but religion preached from that pulpit, and no manner of politics, State or national, directly or indirectly. We came hither, if we came as we professed we did, to hear of those things which pertain to religion, to the salvation of the soul, and to the rest everlasting. And I may be permitted to say for myself that I have uniformly found it to be true, and I have uniformly preached—if I needed to reconcile myself to my attendance upon this church by the consideration of that truth—I have uniformly found it to be true that I hurt nothing, was assailed by nothing, was secularized by nothing, was defended or helped by nothing who I had heard close, no thing for which I had voted or acted in the political world without. All of us spent the week before, and all of us were obliged to spend the week afterwards, more or less in that same beastly, heaving political world; there we acted, there we had to debate, there we had to contend; but I thank my pastor that I am able to say, in the presence of so many, and such respectable clerical friends as these, as I know I have not, that never in an introductory prayer, never in a hymn, never in a line in the ordinary course of public worship selected, never by any illusion in any sermon, by any train of association, right or wrong, carried back into the world that I had left, and which I shall return to in the morrow, that day at least, to have forgotten forever. Of religion, and of correct moral personal life—of these I came to hear, and of these alone have I ever heard at any time. I have no manner of doubt that there are a great many pulpits in Boston of which the same thing can be said. I do not personally know that it might not be said of every one. I know that it can be truly said of this, and I am thankful to be able to draw publicly state that I know it to be true. And now, sir, I have mentioned this subject, my friends, may I be permitted, without presuming to dare plain of anybody, or to dictate to anybody, and still more without assuming to myself to preach *concio ad clerum*, or to preach at all, to the ministry, on behalf of unrestricted and unprofessional laymen, to say one single word to serious clergymen, on the duty of a rigorous abstinence from politics and from any element which has been connected with politics, with active party politics on the Lord's Day. I need not say that I feel I have a great deal too much personal respect and love for that profession, in all its denominations, that I too perfectly appreciate the just and present transcendent good they have done to their country and to mankind, to wish, even if I had it in my power, to abate a tittle of the just respect that is due to them, or to impair in the least degree the just influence which they have acquired and which they possess in this community, still less to intrude into that secret and elevated circle of private judgment which is every man's right. But I will say, I repeat in behalf of laymen, once more, that it is simply because we love and honor them, it is exactly because we would do everything we can, not merely to pay the allotted salary, but everywhere to preserve to them the influence which the selection of their field of duty has entitled them to exert, that I take the liberty, in the presence of you all, to say that I think it is Permit me, then, to suggest, in the first place, that he who preaches on politics, or on any topic in the least degree connected with practical party politics, in the pulpit, lays himself open to temptations which I think very many laymen, that his motives are not entirely unobjectionable, and that thus he does something or does much to unfit him for the full and perfect performance of the great work which he has undertaken to perform and which I do not say that such a man is not a very bold man; I do not say that he is not a very sincere man; I do not say that he is not as bold and sincere as an old prophet standing before a king, and, in the eloquence of an expiring notion, denouncing his sins and the sins of his people. But I mean to say that he runs a great risk of being suspected not to be bold and not to be sincere at all. He runs the risk of being suspected, and he is suspected of denouncing a stockholder, not because he hates the stockholder or feels that he has anything to do with the business, but because some rich man in his congregation hates stockholders, and because he pleases him by denouncing them. He runs the risk of being suspected, not of braving a danger that may arise from a distant region, and a distant public sentiment, but of being afraid of a public sentiment at hand, that may take the form of a danger, that may ruin his salary, or, by possibility, induce the chance of calling a council of dismission. And thus it comes to pass as I submit, and as I have heard it at a large time remarked, that this suspicion unfits him to do the duty which we expect of a minister of the gospel, and thus of doing something to violate that great trust which he took upon himself when he made a public profession of religion. Let no man despise the ministry so far as he was concerned, but to preserve it for its proper influence in the noble sphere which has been assigned to it. Permit me to give as a second reason, in the pursuit of this same course of thought, that intelligent persons, and very many intelligent persons, are too apt to think that the preacher of politics in the pulpit really does not know his business, and that he is either a fool or a knave, or on one side of it, and does not understand his business. We know, sir, that we ought to listen, to the utmost extent of the Protestant theory of independent private judgment, when he interprets the Scriptures, when he teaches as morality; when he testifies of eternal punishment, and "vindicates the ways of God to man"; when he teaches us that we are all sinners; that our natures are alike degraded; that the retributions of a common eternity are before us all. We listen to him, with respect, and with nothing less than reverence; there his studies and his profession have fitted him for it; there he stands upon his own ground, and within his own charmed circle; there he is master, and we are his humble disciples; for that exactly we pray and for that exactly we pay him. But when he has left that ground, when he has taken up the occupation of politics, is not his occupation wholly gone? is not his power of instruction substantially gone? The great concrete of practical politics, the workings of our special considerated system, the laws and conditions of our very artificial nationality, will he permit me to inquire whether or not his deep studies, *ultimate et diverso intuitu*, have enabled him to know anything at all of these? As an educated man, as a religious man, as a student of morals, he will know all about the obligations, origin and general direction of the conscience. He will have learned from his Bible that the race of man is of kindred blood, all of us, and he will have learned from his Bible, or from nature, that all men stand on an equality of right, and responsibility, and duty before God. But how far these glorious principles are modified and controlled by our society, of any description, and by the world of God; how far these rays of light, as Burke beautifully expresses it, are to be refracted, when they go into such a medium as this, how far history shapes all systems, and has shaped our system; how far, in the peculiar circumstances of a territory—a new land—by the common blood and common treasure, makes it proper to lay it open to all, or shut it up against some—does he know aught of this? These things pertain to practical statesmanship, and he is no practical statesman, although he is better and holier and higher.

In saying this in the presence of clergymen, do I disparage the clergy? No more, my friends, you will agree with me, than the honest schoolmaster, who was himself a clergyman, disparged Dominie Sampson, at the time when the world was ringing with his victories, at the opening a doubt whether, after all, His Majesty could conjugate the Greek verb in *mu*—exactly because it was not his business. *Sunum cuique ne in arte credendum est.* You remember how finely Goldsmith recognizes that rule in his "Retaliation." Speaking of Sir Joshua Reynolds, who stood at the head of his profession, the most tolerant, the most modest, the most inquiring of men—and Goldsmith describes him as knowing that none character at the Club, in society, everywhere; but he says of him, in every one one who was conversing with him began to talk of his profession, as he thought, energetic and stuff,

"He shifted his trumpet, and only took snuff."

Let me ask my clerical friends, again speaking for laymen, that they should not be quite fair play between man and man to catch a parishioner in a snow bank—into a caucus? I put it to you if it is fair, my brethren, honest, is it not cruel, and cowardly, so to treat an individual man? But while I hate and despise all manner of cant in religion and politics, and while I do not think the *ad hommem* argument a very good method to the discovery of truth, in logic or out of it, let me, in the hearing of some of the clergy, venture to suggest that the preacher, if he chooses, may find his texts overflows his banks upon party elements connected in the remotest degree with the business or organizations of the day runs a great chance of hindering the salvation of that very soul which he is ordained to promote and secure. They tell us, every one of them, that the salvation of the soul is the highest concern of man; they tell us, every one of them, that nothing on earth or in heaven can be compared with it, to the individual in its consequences.

There I sometimes upon their lips that tremendous expression—whatever it may be in the original, that the salvation of the soul is precious, and it ceases forever." And yet do they not endanger their soul for ever? The layman has no chance except on Sunday, and they rob him of that Sunday; they rob him of the week he has been anxious, busy, troubled, and he comes here on Sunday to be at ease, goes into his house at night time for rest and instruction. The Sunday is all he has, and you take away that Sunday; it is the point of his profession to say, it is for us to say, on behalf of laymen, that it is not the place to commune with the character of a preacher of Religion. Remember the very first word he hears in prayer, the very first word he hears in a hymn selected to be sung, however well it may be sung, and however holy, the very first word he hears in the sermon to which he may listen, sends him away gloomy and irritable, turns the whole service into a political mockery, and awakens a train of reflection that renders it from first to last inscrutable to the truth, closes his ear to the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely on that day. I repeat, then, Sunday is all that such a layman has, and the preacher of politics has cooked his food for that layman.

I do not know very well why I have fallen on this train of thought, and it is high time to have done. Let us close as we began. Let us unite in the wish that our children, and our children's children, when they come into this temple on Sunday, may know as we have always known, and feel as we have always felt, that nothing will be heard from this pulpit; that nothing shall enter here that cannot enter and abide in that higher and better temple of God, to which Religion points us, and to which Religion ministers in fact. That our children and children's children find here, or in other houses of worship, exactly and merely this. Let us, as far as we may, avail ourselves of all the privilege which the Bethel offers to us, and, if I do not overrate the value of those privileges and of the teachings of this pulpit, may that venerable and beloved pastor he able to say, with his last words, as ever to us, "I am innocent of your blood."

THE GREATER EXCOMMUNICATION.

From The Independent.

IT IS with peculiar emotions that we announce to our readers the public and formal excommunication of Rev. Henry Ward Beecher from the anti-slavery ranks. The sentence is pronounced by that high priest of the Garrisonian sect, the Rev. Rev. Parker Pillsbury, in the issue of March 5th. The grounds of this action are that "*practically*, he [Mr. B.] has always turned his back upon the platform of the Anti-Slavery Society, and has sympathized with the most malignant foes." As Mr. Foster indignantly says:

"Nearly leaving us to fight alone the great battle of freedom, in the hottest place, and when we have been at times very hard pressed. It is logically certain, therefore, that he either does not act for the slave at all, or, acting for him from conscientious and other motives, he does it in direct violation of his own theory and convictions. In either case I think the slave has occasion to pray, 'From such a friend, good Lord, deliver us!' Yet, in the case, cannot some friends join in the prayer?"

This excommunication is to take effect until such time as Mr. Beecher shall avow his willingness to stand side by side with Messrs. Garrison and Foster upon their platform. "So long as he shall continue to turn his back upon them, and to associate with the slave's worst enemies, it seems to me but the dictate of common sense, and of Christian charity, to regard him as a man devoid of principle, and unworthy of our confidence and respect."

The office of the Anti-Slavery Standard is authorized to remonstrate against this summary excommunication of Mr. Beecher for a mere difference of opinion as to the best *mode* of using his influence against slavery. As to the platform which Mr. Foster makes "the one infallible test of the sincerity of every man's anti-slavery professions," the editor says:

"This test seems to us arbitrary, inconsequential, unreasonable, absurd, pernicious, and wrong. We believe it will be rejected forever of instinct and reflection, in the name of conscience and common sense, and in the interest of the cause we are set to defend. It is the duty of every man to be thoroughly and uncompromisingly opposed to slavery in all its relations, social, political, or ecclesiastical, that involve complicity therewith; to testify against it continually in whatever sphere of life he may be called to move, and to do all in his power to make anti-slavery principles prevail. Failing in either of these particulars, he will deserve rebuke. But every man has rights, and he is responsible to God and his fellow-men, when the cause is or out of any particular society, or on or off of any platform, to judge for himself of the best means of doing his duty. We may think he judges amiss in this point, and the circumstances might be such as to give us reasonable ground for the fear, if not to suspect, that he is swayed by improper motives; but the *fact itself* that he does not choose to stand upon this or that platform, even while he approves the principles of the platform which he does not occupy, is not by any means conclusive evidence of insincerity. Nor, on the other hand, is the fact that he does occupy such platform conclusive. We know there are, doubtless, many true-hearted friends of the slave who have strong prejudices against the platform, and who, for a few years have often been there and who are yet unworthy of confidence, and who are known to be such as worthless as it is absurd. It doubtedly it is our duty to co-operate with others in efforts to abolish slavery, but the best mode of such co-operation must be determined by circumstances. It is not necessary to Christian charity, in order to co-operate with others, to join with them in a society or to stand with them upon a particular platform."

The is very good sense; but had the same reasoning appeared in *The Independent*, THE STANDARD would have denounced it as pro-slavery sophistry. Indeed, as afraid of its own utterances, the same number of that journal volunteers a denunciation of Mr. Beecher because he does not adopt Dr. Cheever's "mode" of combating slavery. It says:

"Dr. Cheever's friends assert that even Henry Ward Beecher, who might naturally be expected to stand by him, has never cheered him in his anti-slavery work. It is said that he has refused to co-operate in measures to encourage and sustain him in the desperate struggle with the mighty foe of God and humanity. These statements, if true, are highly discreditable to Mr. Beecher, who ought to discern and appreciate the noble spirit of Christian heroism and not shrink from responsibility of giving him needed aid. The withdrawal of a considerable number of the wealthiest members of his Church, and the implied moral condemnation of them, must be by the council, then, as it will be expected, put Dr. Cheever and those who sustain him in a position of much embarrassment; and it is clearly the duty, as it should be the joy, of the friends of a pure Christianity to help them in their struggle to maintain a unshacked pulpit in this pro-slavery city."

Now, the simple fact is, that Mr. Beecher secured, two years ago, in Plymouth Church, what Dr. Cheever has for three years past been laboring to secure in the Church of the Puritans; viz., a pulpit "unshackled" on the subject of slavery. Indeed, almost every Congregational pastor in New York and Brooklyn has long since secured for himself the position of manly Christian independence on this subject which Dr. Cheever is laboring to maintain. There is not one of them who does not have and use his Christian liberty to expose the sinfulness of holding men as chattels, and the wickedness of any voluntary complicity with slavery. Some of these pastors, years ago, demonstrated that Abraham was not a slaveholder, and that the Bible gives no warrant for the system of American slavery. Some of these pastors have worried a good warfare in maintaining the freedom and purity of the Gospel in this matter, and, against denunciation and outcery and calumny, have held their ground and gained their cause. There are diversities of gifts and operations under the same Spirit; and each pastor must judge of the work in his own field. One can say more, and more to the purpose, against slavery, in a single head of a discourse, than another can in a whole sermon. One can effect more by an occasional well-timed word in conversation, than another by a sermon. One can best secure his own independence by creating an outside sentiment to bear upon his Church. Another can accomplish the more courageous and permanent work of *indoctrinating and interpenetrating his own Church with the anti-slavery spirit*, so that instead of resembling those explosive chemicals which are fired off by the least friction, it shall burn with a clear and steady light of testimony against the sin of slavery. No man's gifts, or conscience, or genius can form the rule of action for others. Let each work in his own sphere and way. If Mr. Beecher has found his work easy, let not others envy him. If Dr. Cheever finds the field harder, let not others blame him. If he has found it more difficult to gain the same position with Mr. Beecher and others of his brethren, this may be owing partly to the fact that, years ago, while they were agitating the sentiment of their Churches against slavery, and while the anti-system of the South, he had already so conspicuous in this warfare as has been since 1856, the date which THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD assigns for the beginning of the true anti-slavery spirit. John the Baptist, Peter, and James, and John, and Stephen, had already borne their testimony for Christ in behalf of the oppressed, when Paul appeared with the fervor of his zeal and the fire of his logic, mightily convincing men out of the Scriptures. Perhaps Paul has been raised up for a special missionary work which needs to be accomplished in this matter.

If the Church of the Puritans need financial aid to help them in the struggle to keep their own pulpit unshackled, we trust that this will not be wanting. We learn, however, that the financial embarrassments of which THE STANDARD speaks have already been removed by the efficiency of the friends of the Society for cancelling its debt. But the freedom of the pulpit will be the evidence of the ministry in testifying against slavery do not hinge upon the technicalities of their conflict. There are pulpits in Boston which have been for years "unshackled" and "unmuzzled" in this anti-slavery cause; there are ministers who are "thoroughly and uncompromisingly opposed to slavery," who have no manner of longing "to stand in the pulpit of the Church," who, standing on the ground of the Gospel, "aid in the diffusion of sound anti-slavery principles," but who, in all this labor for the oppressed, ask nobody's pulpit, seek nobody's aid. We regard Mr. Beecher as one of these discreet, discriminating opponents of slavery, and we do not think he should be expelled from the anti-slavery ranks simply because he declined to intermeddle in the domestic affairs of the Church of the Puritans, or to make himself the champion of an unshackled pulpit," with more palpable success, though with less controversial notoriety. We therefore pronounce Mr. Foster's decree of excommunication upon Mr. Beecher, and the implied censure of Mr. Dr. Cheever, THE STANDARD, to be "without warrant and without validity" and we unhesitatingly recommend him to the entire confidence of all who hate slavery and seek its abolition, as in good and regular standing, and entitled to be so received everywhere.

ANTI-SLAVERY IRRITATION.

THERE is a class of men—fortunately neither numerous nor influential—who make it a business to travel up and down the land, talking and preaching impracticable things about the extermination of slavery, and pitching into everybody that dare to dissent from their opinion. They are the natural allies of the great boo-hoo party, and as such, and as counter irritants upon Parson Brownlow, Keitt, Toombs, and other fire-eaters, they may perhaps be set down as a part of the compensation that could not well be dispensed with. These men are represented by Garrison, Phillips, Burleigh, and their followers—denouncers of the Constitution, maligners of the Church, unfaithful shepherds of God, all of them, and hitherto they have been allowed an undisputed monopoly of the so-called "opposition to slavery."

To say that these men have all along been advocating the cause of slavery in relation to slavery is to insult the wisdom of the entire Northern people, who have repudiated them utterly as demagogues; and to say that they have *not* properly represented the Northern sentiment is to throw discredit upon the proceedings of a meeting of very respectable gentlemen, held not very long since, where their example seems to have been emulated to a very successful degree. We can only regret that there are Congregational clergymen, or good men of any denomination, however few in number or influence, who should look with an evil eye upon the capital of Garrison & Co., and either attempt an outright robbery of their stock in trade or open negotiations for a partnership—thereby involving, in either event, a destruction of the aforesaid monopoly, which the North has come to regard with so much satisfaction. We say we regret it if such be the fact; but we do not think that the conduct hitherto on the subject of slavery has been, with rare exceptions, honorable and dignified, just such, in fact, as to give a good moral tone to that awakened public sentiment that proposes merely to restrain an evil that it cannot remove. We can see no good to result from a hundred thousand of such meetings and associations as this one at Worcester, and we regret this morning; for while a good principle is at the bottom, it has been made to have been placed thereon. If there are people who think differently, however, they can read the report in another column and judge for themselves.—*Norwich (Ct.) Courier—A Republican paper!*

CONSEQUENCES OF ABOLITIONISM.

UNTIL abolitionism had reared its ugly head in the North, the tendency of legislation in the Southern States was to emancipation of the blacks and amelioration of their condition. It has been different since, of which fact we have an striking illustration in recent action of Missouri. The House of Representatives of that State has passed an act which provides that no slave shall be deemed emancipated until his master shall have entered into bonds in the sum of two thousand dollars to remove the negro within ninety days after the emancipation shall take effect, if any negro who may thus have been transported from the State shall return, he shall be reduced to slavery. All free negroes who may be residents of the State in the present condition of the law are declared and made slaves the sheriff may sell them. A provision of the bill is that the money arising from the sale of such negroes shall constitute part of the school fund of the State. This bill is in accordance with the doctrine of Mr. Frank P. Blair, Jr., the Black Republican champion who was brought to this State last year and put upon the stump. That is, that a condition of the emancipation of all slaves should be that they should leave the State. That is the doctrine of Frank P. Blair, Jr.; it is the doctrine of Abraham Lincoln; it is the doctrine of Republicanism; and it cannot be denounced unless be be denounced. But, forty years ago, before the rise of abolitionism, and before it had provoked the South to stringent measures regarding negroes, this would have been considered very liberal legislation. The fact is, abolitionism is the worst enemy the negroes have ever had.—*Detroit Free Press.*

Selections.

CAPTAIN BROWN IN IOWA.

"OLD Captain Brown of Kansas!" Thave set my eyes on this old hero, feared by Missouri invaders and loved by the free men of liberty in Kansas as a father. He is in company of twelve colored people (who I only dare *guess* were once slaves) *en route* for Canada, where I trust they are safe.

Let me be in a historic character. In the family simple-hearted as a child, he narrates stirring scenes, placing himself in the background of the picture; while an eye on the most determined expression I ever saw at once supplies what he modestly omits, and shows the man of iron in action. He is the impersonation of firmness. Among his company, white and black, with a long, gray beard, and a head frosted with sixty winters, he walks like a patriarch, if that early name implies leadership and devotion.

Those of his company destined for Canada, if not impeded, were to have gone south to Texas. Capt. Brown avows his philosophy to be the showing of Border Ruffians that they have enough to do in taking care of slaves in Missouri, without making a foray on the people of Kansas to establish slavery there against the votes and wishes of that people. As God spares him, he says, he will convince the poor ignorant slaveholders of the fact that in open day he conducted out those who dreaded next to death a more Southern prison-house. Two companies of slave-hunters, headed by a marshal, looked upon them, but were not ready to lose their lives in a negro hunt. Since the exodus, a child was born among them, which was at once named "*Captain John Brown.*"

A reward of $3,000 by the Governor of Missouri for Brown, with the value of his company as chattels, has made him quite a hero through the State of Iowa. The "dirt-eating Democracy" covet the reward, but keep at a good distance from the cold lead, and have no desire to be awed into silence and shame by one glance from the iron hero, who feels that God will cover his head in the day of battle." Stronger than fiction have been his escapes and exploits in Kansas. Combining the gentleness of a Christian, the love of a patriot, and the skill and boldness of a commander, whether fighting his career for a quiet home or in bloody strife, the freemen of Kansas will hallow his memory, and history will name him the Cromwell of our border wars.

How unlike the "Old Brown" stotched with fiendish hate in the man at your fireside. His mouth unpolluted with tobacco; strong drinks abjured; neither in parlance nor conversation grave, and occupied with pleasant memories of other days. He drops a tear of gratitude on the mention of the practical kindness of Dr. H. to him in the hour of extremity. He recurs to the mild principles and hearty affection of Dr. Osgood of Springfield, on whose ministry he attended for five years. He had a lucrative occupation as wool grower and dealer in Ohio, and gained a medal as exhibitor of wool at the World's Fair; but now finds himself in the "wool business" still, in a land where sure wool grows longer than the young Hebrew shepherd found in the beasts that took a lamb out of the flock.

I am well informed that the people at Grinnell took care of his company for two days, furnishing them food for their journey, and on Sabbath evening our Lyceum gave him an hour, as well as on Saturday evening.

—Independent. FREEMAN.

CLERICAL CALUMNY.

From The Liberator.

MR. EDITOR,—Whose works were held in high esteem by pious people half a century ago, as being well suited to stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance of the things they were most apt to forget and neglect—wrote a little book called "Profession not Principle." It has passed through many editions, received the approbation of the Church, and may still be found on the upper shelves of the libraries of elderly people of a serious turn, but is little read at the present day. Since it contains nothing against slavery, and still less, the *time* you now are paying excitement, we suggest to the American Tract Society, that it be a new edition of it for the special benefit of the clergy, who seem to be preeminently under the dominion of the spirit of which it proposes. Perhaps the language of these Reverend gentlemen, ever since philanthropy has been doing those works of Christian reform which the Church left undone, they have held "profession" to be the important part of the Christian, and "principle" to be the latest instance of the verbal expression of this idea—it is constantly expressed in the *actions* of the clergy—we find in an account, given by the Worcester correspondent of the *Hist and Bee*, of an address delivered in the Union Church, Worcester, on the evening of the 17th inst., by Rev. Henry T. Cheever of Jewett city, Connecticut, in explanation of the ideas of the new "Church Anti-Slavery Society of the United States," which he had just helped to manufacture. Among the reasons given by this gentleman for the formation of such a Society was the following:

"2. There seems has been any distinct Christian or Church Anti-Slavery Society. The American Anti-Slavery Society did a great pioneer work, and its originators were men of whom the country and the world were not worthy, but it never was distinctly Christian, and latterly it had come to be unduly guided by men, truly and thoroughly anti-slavery indeed, and so far having our fullest sympathy, but notoriously and avowedly rejectors and opponents of the fundamentals of Christianity. In view of this fact, the 'Church Anti-Slavery Society' meets a long felt want."

The "long felt want" here spoken of has been borne by the Reverend gentleman and his associates with exemplary fortitude. They have so effectually kept their desires, in subjection as to have refrained, for many years from all outward and visible manifestation of them. The last faint approach towards such a manifestation was made by this City in May, 1857, when it was announced in the *Transcript* (and also by a written notice placed upon the vestibule of the hall where the New England Anti-Slavery Convention were holding their Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting) that a "Church Anti-Slavery Meeting" would be held in Boston, and held (of all places in the world) in Park Street Church.

At this meeting—in which the church-members of Boston were called upon themselves ready to come together for the examination of slavery to the full extent of their ability, *when the clergy called them*—there was abundance of strong denunciation of slavery, without even the attempt to make a calculated and attentive audience to organize or act for its immediate abolition, or even to have the courage to follow up the impression there made by the appointment of subsequent meetings. The strongest speech on the occasion was made by Rev. George B. Chevver; and this was a declaration that "*the mode of dealing with the slaves should be born free after forty years would be* "THE SIMPLEST REMEDY OF THE WHOLE INIQUITY THAT COULD BE CONCEIVED OF." The selection of the mode of emancipation set forth was made as the fit and qualified eulogy—the declaration, by a minister least tainted with compromise of all the holders of the *Christian* Anti-Slavery meeting, that he would be perfectly satisfied to leave the existing institution of slavery as it now stands through their whole lives—is significant and noteworthy. The notion of our readers is—what were the points of diversity, between the Anti-Slavery meetings then simultaneously going on in the Melodeon and in Park Street Church. We answer, that the holders of the latter to be separate it, by way of contrast, the "*Christian* Anti-Slavery Meeting."

The social points of diversity between the New England Anti-Slavery Convention and the Park Street meeting were these—

1. The former was one link in a chain of operations which has lasted twenty-seven years, and is to last until slavery is abolished, involving the entire labor of the work of discussing principles and measures, and raising funds, to incite the people of the United States to earnest and persistent warfare against slavery.

The latter was a single afternoon's meeting, making no arrangement, and expressing no desire, for any further action upon its subject.

2. The former was free to all speakers, seeking the aid of all those who wished to oppose slavery.

The latter was not free at all, and permitted nobody to speak except clergymen, who had previously been selected and invited by other clergymen.

3. The former vindicated, enlarged and strengthened its established principles, and made the application of these ideas and purposes: SLAVEHOLDING IS A SIN AGAINST GOD. NO COMPROMISE WITH SLAVERY!—NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

The latter seemed to its hearers with fervid declamation, and then left their awakened interest to cool and evaporate, without even the attempt to direct it to action.

4. The former called itself, as usual, an "Anti-Slavery Convention."

The latter christened and advertised itself a "*Christian* Anti-Slavery meeting."

Now, since the points just mentioned are the only points of difference between these two meetings, it must be some or all of these upon which is founded the claim of the latter to be considered (in itself, and also by contrast with the former) a *Christian* meeting.

But, in every one of these points, that is to say, in systematic operation, in freedom, in thoroughness, in practical efficiency, and in appellation, as it seems to us, the Park Street meeting was less satisfactory and less Christian than the other. Yes, even in appellation. For the latter meeting, if it had been obliged to intervene to arrange the difficulty. But who knows how long the settlement will last, or whether the egg which is now hatched is not as addled as the one over which the President lately cackled?

"THE APOSTLES OF ANTI-SLAVERY."

IF was either by accident or design, and which we cannot say, that just two years ago, there met in an obscure place in Boston, Jan. 1st, 1832, to organize the New England Anti-Slavery Society. The father of "the Twelve," since he was the first President, was Arnold Buffum, a Quaker, aged 65 years. The youngest, last week, died at Englewood, near Perth Amboy, N. J., aged 77 years. During twenty-seven years he constantly maintained his "*testimony*" against chattel slavery, and saw the great cause, which he had helped to plant and water—growing more lovely in his character as years increased, till, fully ripe, on the quiet of the Sabbath, his spirit went from the house of his children on earth to the mansions of his Father in heaven.

We are reminded by his decease of the early struggles in the anti-slavery cause. Though there never was much anti-slavery spirit in this locality, yet of "The Twelve" who instituted that first Society, three were from the limits of "Old Norfolk"—viz., Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Henry C. Wright* and Joshua Coffin—being one-quarter of the whole. Most of "The Twelve" lived to see the principle for which they struggled and for which they suffered a sort of martyrdom, in being repudiated by society as fanatics and madmen, in having their property and persons given to the mobs, some of them being stoned, having halters about their necks and being dragged through the streets, and having rewards offered for their heads—most of them lived, we repeat, to see the principle in question triumph among the British, French, Danes and Dutch, in acts of emancipation for their bondmen. They also saw the little fire which they kindled in an obscure corner, where it would seem that a single man could have put his foot upon it and extinguished it forever, burn on brighter and more wide-spread, till it warmed into life all the land and made it ready to receive the seed of the growing question the one great question of this people and this age. We know not how those of them who yet survive feel about the matter, but it has certainly been a success beyond their most sanguine hopes, if they ever were in any great enterprise like theirs.

William Lloyd Garrison, who was the soul of the movement, is yet young enough to hope to see slavery extinguished in America. However that may be, he has stamped his name on this great reform, till the letters are so luminous that they are read from all lands and all climes. Perhaps personal ambition was not one of the moving causes of his action; but had it been, there was no more direct way to honorable fame than he has taken. In years to come, when men will look back upon the slavery of our day with as much indifference as we do upon Algerine servitude or any other abuse of humanity, he will stand as Wilberforce and Clarkson, and those who wrought out British emancipation, do in the annals of English philanthropy. His connection with other minor questions will be forgotten in the light of this, and the errors he may have committed will moulder away when he is in his grave, while still forever will he stand the central light of the emancipation period.

There have strange things happened in this world. We have lived to see the doors of every public office here closed upon Garrison as they would be upon a wild beast, because of his anti-slavery; and we have lived to see the doors of the City Hall swing open to receive that same Garrison, and the crowded room echo with the applause of people as he entered, also because of his anti-slavery. It may be less than half a century, when the centennial anniversary of his birth will be celebrated if slavery should then be abolished in the land, that the children of this generation will celebrate the day, and boast that here was born, nurtured, and died, as a great honor to their city. Suppose in the twilight of his life, some one should have rose reached manhood should stop where now stands the house on School street in which he first saw the light, to gaze upon a tall and commanding structure with a bronze statue upon its summit and glowing words of eulogy at its base, they would not [illegible] the sentiment that has sense to see every in the last thirty years; and it is not improbable that such an event will occur, though we do not advise the project to be advance upon the value of the estate in anticipation thereof.—*Newburyport (Mass.) Herald.*

OUR NEIGHBORS.

For the following advertisements, we are indebted to the *Central Christian Advocate*. Though scanted for room, we give them a place, inasmuch as they reveal new beauties in the patriarchal institution, and will help to check, if we mistake not, the rashness of those infatuated men who are agitating the question of slavery without any regard to law. The first is taken from the Sumpter County (Ala.) *Whig*—the second from the Dadeville *Banner*, same State.

NEGRO DOGS.—The undersigned, having bought the entire pack of Negro Dogs of the Bay & Alex stock, now proposes to catch runaway negroes. His charges will be three dollars per day, and ten dollars for each negro he may apprehend and deliver. He resides three and one half miles north of Livingston, near the Sucarnoochee River.

WILLIAM GAMBELL.

Nov. 6, 1845—6m.

NOTICE.—The undersigned, having an excellent pack of hounds for the purpose of catching negroes, would inform the public that his prices in future will be as follows for such service:

For each day employed in hunting or trailing $2 00
For catching each slave 10 00
For bringing over ten miles, and catching slaves 20 00

If scent fur, the above prices will be exacted in cash. The subscriber resides one mile east of the Tallapoosa River, on the Dadeville, Sept. 1, 1852—1f. B. BLACK.

What Democracy! What brilliant examples of apostolic zeal in caring even for the lowest of men! What efforts to reclaim a wandering brother from the error of his way! It is plain that we stand upon the extent and that in we are greatly privileged to be able to inform Congress "that the long-pending controversy between the two governments," *i. e.*, those of Great Britain and the United States, "in relation to the question of impressment of seamen, has been amicably adjusted." "The claim, on the part of Great Britain, to be permitted to say, 'forcibly to visit American vessels on the high seas in time of peace, could not be sustained under the law of nations, and has been overruled by her own most eminent jurists." After detailing, with the history of recent alleged outrages in the Gulf of Mexico and the adjacent seas, he added that "the British government in proposed its recognition of the principles of international law on this subject, and the Secretary of the government of the United States, in the note of the Secretary of State to the British minister at Washington, dated March 10, 1858, which secure the vessels of the United States from the right of search, or visitation or search in time of peace, *under any circumstances whatever.*"

This would seem to be satisfactory, for what more could be wished than the utter renunciation of the rights vessels from visitation and search? It was accordingly claimed, by the partisans of the Administration, that it had finally disposed of a vexatious and constantly-recurring difficulty, and that it had provided against repetitions. We said at the time that this was rather claiming too much, for, on turning to the letter of the Secretary of State alluded to, we found that he had really stated no so particularly. He had only stated that "a merchant vessel upon the high seas is protected by her national character. He who forcibly enters her does so upon his own responsibility. Undoubtedly, if a vessel assumes a national character, to which she is not entitled, and is guilty of false colors, she cannot be protected by this assumption of a nationality to which she has no claim. As the identity of a vessel can be determined, at a like hazard to him who doubtedly the flag she displays, searches her to ascertain her true character." "If the boarding officer had just grounds of suspicion, and deported himself with propriety in the performance of his task, doubtless no just complaint would arise; but when satisfied of his error, no nation would make such an act the subject of serious reclamation."

Well might Lord Malmesbury and her Majesty's government have agreed entirely in this statement of the question; inasmuch as it concluded, the question and the matter, all that the British government has ever asserted, or all, at least, that it has asserted in later years. But it was far from being a final disposition of the cause of dispute. The question of the right of search, which had formerly been, at the discretion of the naval officers, holding them only to a responsibility for the abuse or improper discharge of their trust. Lord Malmesbury did not limit himself to the mere adjustment of the case before it is clear, because he immediately proposed to the government of the United States "to adopt some mutual regulation by which the officers of both States should be enabled to verify the nationality of suspicious ships" in order to prevent the renewal of "those vexatious and irritating controversies which are inevitable, as long as the letter of international law is made inflexibly to overrule those measures which experience and common sense recommend as necessary for the security of life and property on the high seas." A settlement which left vexatious and irritating controversies inevitable was not a settlement to be easily grafted. It was a settlement to be resettled, and a telegraphic despatch of yesterday, paraded by the organ of the Administration in this city, shows that another incubation has been performed, and another hatchery has been made. The designs of the Administration when satisfied of his error, no nation would make such an act the subject of serious reclamation." "

Well might Lord Malmesbury and her Majesty's government have agreed entirely in this statement of the question; inasmuch as it concluded, the question and the matter, all that the British government has ever asserted, or all, at least, that it has asserted in later years. But it was far from being a final disposition of the cause of dispute. The question of the right of search, which had formerly been, at the discretion of the naval officers, holding them only to a responsibility for the abuse or improper discharge of their trust. Lord Malmesbury did not limit himself to the mere adjustment of the case before it is clear, because he immediately proposed to the government of the United States "to adopt some mutual regulation by which the officers of both States should be enabled to verify the nationality of suspicious ships" in order to prevent the renewal of "those vexatious and irritating controversies which are inevitable, as long as the letter of international law is made inflexibly to overrule those measures which experience and common sense recommend as necessary for the security of life and property on the high seas." A settlement which left vexatious and irritating controversies inevitable was not a settlement to be easily grafted. It was a settlement to be resettled, and a telegraphic despatch of yesterday, paraded by the organ of the Administration in this city, shows that another incubation has been performed, and another hatchery has been made. The designs of the Administration when satisfied of his error, no nation would make such an act the subject of serious reclamation." "

* The United States and England have failed to cease to any definite understanding regarding the right of search or visit—our government claiming that it is only under the law of nations, and England refusing to submit any new plan—the French government have stepped in and suggested a plan, which, if it be satisfactory to both, the government has adopted, and which will probably settle the vexed question. It has not yet been made public."

This is certainly a curious condition of things, after the loud proclamation of an amicable and complete adjustment in the message; the two governments have failed to come to any definite understanding in the premises; and a third power has obliged to intervene to arrange the difficulty. But who knows how long this settlement will last, or whether the egg which is now hatched is not as addled as the one over which the President lately cackled?

THE APOSTLES OF ANTI-SLAVERY.

IF was either by accident or design, and which we cannot say, that just two years ago, there met in an obscure place in Boston, Jan. 1st, 1832, to organize the New England Anti-Slavery Society. The father of "The Twelve," since he was the first President, was Arnold Buffum, a Quaker, aged

preparations to proceed to the coast of Africa for the purpose of being employed in that traffic.

The master of the bark was not on board at the time of her capture, having made a visit to this place, where he seemed to be well known by many persons. He was accompanied by the supercargo, and a man occupying the position of a servant. The mate reported that there had been a Spanish captain on board, who was landed at St. Joseph; the American captain, but has since confessed that he was killed and thrown overboard. The vessel's name had been altered, and that of the Rosa Lee substituted, and the paint was still fresh on the arrival of the Vixen.

The captain of the bark left here in a small fishing boat on Tuesday evening last, for the purpose, as he said, of proceeding to his vessel in St. Joseph, but since then nothing has been heard from him. We are also informed that a party left here last evening for the purpose of arresting the captain, supercargo, and other men in their company.

The bark is reported to be the property of C. A. L. Lamar, of Savannah. The name of the master is Hayden, and that of the supercargo Delamuyer. Hayden, when he came to this place, registered his name, we are informed, Hill, in the club room, and gave as a reason that he had been captain of a vessel in Savannah, and, having got into a difficulty with his men, wished to conceal himself for some time.

Various were the reports circulated as to the character of the vessel while she was in St. Joseph. At first she was a pirate of sixty tons, engaged by a hunting party—then she became a ship, with nine hundred slaves aboard—then various other reports were in circulation, as to her character, none of which were reliable.

There are a few wise heads about town who pretend to know more than they really do, saying that the vessel has been concealed in St. Joseph for over two weeks; but this is not true, although we are told, by one whom we can rely upon, that she has been there over a week. She was up higher in St. Joseph bay than any other vessel, rigged vessel was ever before, and if she had slaves aboard has had time and opportunity enough to run them clear of all prying persons.

There has not as yet been any legal examination as to the character of the vessel, nor she is still under the surveillance of the officers of the steamer Vixen. We have only seen the vessel at a distance, but sailors tell us that she is a beautiful craft, possessing qualities which would make her a fine sailer, and with sea room would give any vessel trouble to catch her. We understand that the United States District Judge and Attorney have been telegraphed to proceed here immediately, for the purpose of investigating the character of the vessel.

There were ten men aboard of the vessel at the time of her capture, who have been confined under close guard ever since. She had on board many casks of water, by far more than any vessel of her size would carry on the longest voyage, with the usual complement of men. No weapons were found on board of the bark, and at the time of her arrest she was flying American colors. We have also been informed that she had no signs of having been on a voyage as yet, but was merely fitting out.

Since writing the above, we have been informed that a suspicious schooner has been seen lying off the coast, showing no desire of entering this harbor, or of being spoken by the pilots. It is supposed by some that the schooner with provisions, &c., for the above bark to proceed upon her voyage.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1859.

CORRESPONDENTS will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "*Editor of the Anti-Slavery Standard*, 138 *Nassau street, New York*."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the Anti-Slavery Standard*, 138 *Nassau street, New York*."

REMOVAL.—The office of THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD will be removed, on or before the first of May, to the Park Bank Building, No. 5 Beekman street, adjoining Lovejoy's Hotel.

THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will hold its Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting in this city, commencing Tuesday morning, May 10th, and closing in the afternoon of Wednesday. The place of meeting will be in the City Assembly Rooms, 448 Broadway. Official call next week.

FOX-HUNTING.

It is a pity that so much space is required to untwist the windings of misrepresentation in which *The Independent* involves its readers, and a still greater pity that the corrections which the dishonesty of that paper so often makes necessary are not allowed to appear in its own at present, to impose upon the incredulity of that small portion of the American Church which (whether for the sake of the Church or of the slave) really desires to oppose slavery, we cannot do a more useful work than to follow their tortuous course, and unveil that department of their deceits which assails our own work and postpones the deliverance of the slave.

The Independent (see first page) represents that the accusation recently made by Stephen S. Foster against Henry Ward Beecher was "for a mere difference of opinion as to the best mode of using his influence against slavery." On the contrary, it was an accusation of both unsoundness and unfaithfulness in regard to anti-slavery; of unsoundness, judged by what Mr. Foster considers sound—and of unfaithfulness to Mr. Beecher's own light, judged by the better parts of his own utterances in regard to slavery. We also hold Mr. Beecher to be both unsound and unfaithful. The point which we urged in reply to Mr. Foster was that genuine anti-slavery, in the heart and in the life, does not necessarily require that a man should formally join, or obviously fraternize with, the American Anti-Slavery Society. Such soundness and faithfulness may exist without such formal adhesion. Where we see evidence of such soundness and faithfulness, we shall never censure, however much we may lament, the fact that such an honest laborer in our common Master's vineyard follows not with us—sees not eye to eye with us. We have always steadfastly maintained the right of every man to judge for himself the proper method of anti-slavery warfare; but we have maintained with equal steadfastness the *duty* of every man to engage in *some* warfare which shall really tell *against* slavery; which shall be really *anti*-slavery; and which shall be *consistently* anti-slavery, not pulling down with one hand that which it builds up with the other; and we have also (according to the precept and example of Jesus) insisted on making men's lives the test of the honesty of their professions.

It is by faithfulness in these last-mentioned particulars that we have gained the ill-will and the calumnious assaults of *The Independent*. Its editors have for several years past been trying to reconcile an aspect of zeal for the welfare of the slave with the continued service of their old master, that very American Church which has been, and remains, the great bulwark of slavery. Since reputation, not character, is the Church's stock in trade, and since its reputation was becoming damaged by the wider exposure of the guilt of that slaveholding which it still chose to uphold, it was necessary that some one, in the name and for the credit of the Church, should seem to discountenance slavery. This *seeming* has been managed by the clerical editors of *The Independent*, whose condemnation of the *abuses* of slavery (in the ingenious language of the Tract Society, "those moral evils which it [slavery] is known to promote") has been taken, by the too confiding people who weekly listen to their written and spoken sermons, to be a condemnation of slaveholding itself. The endorsement which these editors give to Mr. Beecher as one of the "thorough, uncompromising opponents of slavery" at a time when the Abolitionists are finding fault with him, and when he is reported to be shrinking from support of the bolder utterances of Dr. Cheever, is no doubt polite and sagacious. It distinguishes them—in the minds of that great majority of their readers and hearers who are willing to be deceived—from radicals, such as Dr. Cheever and the American Anti-Slavery Society are reputed to be; and it saves the credit and the Christian (!) character of those slaveholding church-members in the South generally, and in the mission Churches of the Foreign and Home Missionary Societies, with whom they, as well as Mr. Beecher, hold communion as "Christian brethren." Well may Dr. Thompson and Dr. Bacon endorse Henry Ward Beecher! For, for every act of treachery to anti-slavery with which he has been charged, they have committed ten, the same in kind, and greater in degree.

Moreover, while Mr. Beecher only shrinks from endorsing Dr. Cheever Drs. Thompson and Bacon are busily working to undermine his influence. The instinct of self-preservation no doubt moves them to this; for their paltering, compromising, half-and-half method of dealing with slavery is exposed and put to shame by Dr. Cheever's direct and vigorous attacks upon its very citadel. Whenever he speaks of the duty of "dashing with untempered mortar," they must feel themselves described and rebuked; whenever he speaks of "building up Zion," and of the imperative obligation that rests upon the Church to assail the centre and core of that iniquity, instead of cautiously snipping and paring away some of the more odious of its outward developments, they must feel the hollowness of their twaddle about "those moral duties which grow out of the existence of slavery, and those moral evils which it is known to promote"; when he uses the truths of the Old and New Testaments "as a fire and a hammer" to break slavery in pieces, they must feel ashamed of their pet "Tract Society at Boston," which formally advertises itself as declining to do anything more than "*fraternally* to discuss those moral evils which slavery is known to promote"; and when the "Church Anti-Slavery Society" (which he has just helped to form at Worcester) recognizes its obligation "to inculcate the duties of civil government, of civil rulers and of citizens," in respect to the overthrow of slavery, they must feel the unspeakable meanness, feebleness and cowardice of *their* resolution, adopted by their votes in the National Tract Society at New York, and echoed, through their influence, in the auxiliary Society at Boston, as follows: "Resolved, That the political aspects of slavery lie entirely without the character, none of which were reliable.

There are a few wise heads about town who pretend to know more than they really do, saying that the vessel has been concealed in St. Joseph for over two weeks; but this is not true, although we are told, by one whom we can rely upon, that she has been there over a week. She was up higher in St. Joseph bay than any other vessel, rigged vessel was ever before, and if she had slaves aboard has had time and opportunity enough to run them clear of all prying persons.

There has not as yet been any legal examination as to the character of the vessel, nor she is still under the surveillance of the officers of the steamer Vixen. We have only seen the vessel at a distance, but sailors tell us that she is a beautiful craft, possessing qualities which would make her a fine sailer, and with sea room would give any vessel trouble to catch her. We understand that the United States District Judge and Attorney have been telegraphed to proceed here immediately, for the purpose of investigating the character of the vessel.

There were ten men aboard of the vessel at the time of her capture, who have been confined under close guard ever since. She had on board many casks of water, by far more than any vessel of her size would carry on the longest voyage, with the usual complement of men. No weapons were found on board of the bark, and at the time of her arrest she was flying American colors. We have also been informed that she had no signs of having been on a voyage as yet, but was merely fitting out.

Since writing the above, we have been informed that a suspicious schooner has been seen lying off the coast, showing no desire of entering this harbor, or of being spoken by the pilots. It is supposed by some that the schooner with provisions, &c., for the above bark to proceed upon her voyage.

THE PERSONAL LIBERTY BILL.

ALBANY, April 7, 1859.

Hollis Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

On Wednesday evening the Assembly laid aside the regular order of business and took up the Personal Liberty bill, and went through with it, ordering it to a third reading (its virtual passage) by a vote of 65 to 16. The evening was occupied in debate, and it was until eleven o'clock. Mr. Hutchinson made a most convincing speech for the bill, as did also Mr. Laing, of Wayne, and Mr. Holt, of Wyoming. Mr. Laing's speech was one of the best in the whole discussion. He is evidently a strong believer in Lysander Spooner's theories. Brief remarks were also made by Mr. Powell, Mr. Perry and Mr. Schofield in favor, and by Mr. Warner, Mr. Weisant, Mr. Gover and Mr. Rutherford against the bill. The bill was amended by striking out the 13th section, which forbids any lawyer to act as counsel for the claimant of a slave. It was said that even murderers are allowed counsel, and it seemed but decent to allow a slaveholder what was allowed every other criminal. The amendment was agreed to without much opposition. I hope soon to chronicle its final passage in the Assembly.

The Republicans here were surprised to hear that Massachusetts had failed to come up to the mark on this bill; that your labors have eminently tended to establish these truths: First, that the Word of God in no degree countenances any system, law or institution constituting or recognizing slaveholding as a right; secondly, that a large portion of our own country; secondly, that Christianity is essentially, virtually, irreconcilably at war with such slavery, and that any true and pure Church is necessarily its antagonist; thirdly, that it is the imperative duty of the organized Christianity of the land to vote against such slavery, systematically, unfailingly, uncompromisingly, so long as the institution shall continue to exist. We, therefore, in testimony of our profound appreciation of your labors and sacrifices in the cause of Christian Purity and National Righteousness, respectfully invite you to be present, at such early day as your convenience may suggest, one or more of your recent discourses on the subjects just indicated, in the great hall of the Cooper Institute, where some thousands of our Christian brethren may share with us the interest and profit of hearing you.

We are, with profound esteem, yours,

[Ex-Gov.] Myron H. Clark,	Wm. Curtis Noyes,
John Jay,	[Rev.] H. Ward Beecher,
Wm. M. Evarts,	[Rev.] Thos. S. Hastings,
Isaac Bronson,	James Humphrey,
R. H. McCurdy,	Wm. Allen Butler,
[Rev.] Ed. H. Chapin,	Oliver Johnson,
Chas. W. Elliott,	John W. Edmonds,
Joseph Hoxie,	Chas. A. Dana,
T. B. Stillman,	S. P. Townsend,
Benj. F. Manierre,	Simeon Draper,
George William Curtis,	A. W. Morgan,
[Rev.] A. H. Burlingham,	[Prof.] Benj. N. Martin,
R. Hildreth,	[Rev.] T. Bourne,
Dexter Fairbank,	Henry A. Hart, M.D.,
R. W. Chester,	James O. Bennett,
Edward Gilbert,	Edwin West, M.D.,
Sydney H. Gay,	James Fairman,
Chas. T. Congdon,	Franklin J. Otterson,
Samuel Sinclair,	and others,

NEW YORK, April 1, 1859.

MESSRS. HORACE GREELEY, JOHN JAY and others.

GENTLEMEN: I am truly grateful for this kind invitation, and rejoice in the opportunity of acknowledging it, were it only to bear my respectful testimony to the truth of its principles, so admirably expressed. I am sure that, if we can get at the masses with the testimony of the Word of God against the iniquity of slavery, it will soon be swept from the land. I shall be most happy to respond to this request in one or more lectures, as may be thought best, commencing Wednesday evening, April 6.

Most respectfully and truly yours,

GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

Those who are familiar with the names of the clergymen and laymen who usually figure in the fashionable religious and philanthropic movements of the so-called evangelical denominations cannot fail to observe how few such names appear in this correspondence. The cry of the orthodox clergy heretofore has been, "Oh, we are as much opposed to slavery as anybody, but we can't join the abolition movement, because, in doing so, we must mix ourselves up with men whose religious views we cannot sanction." It would seem as if Dr. Cheever had been specially raised up by Providence to furnish a new demonstration of the hypocrisy of these men. Of unquestionable soundness according to the severest standard of orthodoxy, he is not in any way identified with the Anti-Slavery organization. Received as a theologian and of good reputation for piety, he stands forth as a minister of the Gospel to rebuke the nation for the sin of slaveholding and to plead with prophet-like eloquence the cause of the oppressed. Might we not reasonably expect the whole body of the evangelical clergy to rally promptly to the standard which he unfurls before them? And yet, they are not. Such is the fact. Of the Congregational pastors of New York and Brooklyn how many are ready to ask him to repeat his anti-slavery discourses? Henry Ward Beecher is the only one of them all whose name appears in the above correspondence. Of the host of Old and New School Presbyterian clergy only one signs the letter to Dr. Cheever; of the army of Methodist clergy not one; of the Baptists *one*, and he not by any means a representative of the Baptist denomination; of the Episcopalians not one; of the Reformed Dutch not one. Of evangelical laymen there are indeed some highly respectable names, but they are for the most part those which have been known in political anti-slavery movements rather than in the fashionable philanthropy of the Churches. The experiences of the gentlemen who did the work of soliciting signatures to the requisition upon Dr. Cheever would, we fancy, be very instructive. The simple fact is, that the efforts of Dr. Cheever to arouse the evangelical Ministers and Churches to a sense of the wickedness of slavery and the duty of testifying against it have thus far proved a failure. They have responded to him only as the Scribes and Pharisees responded to the preaching of Jesus; and if crucifixion were now the mode of punishing "fanatics" and "disturbers of the peace of the Churches," they would hardly shrink from nailing him to the cross, so bitter is their hatred of the truth he preaches. As it is, they can only exhibit their hostility in assaults upon his personal and professional reputation, in denunciations of him as "imprudent," "a man of one idea," "a man of one hobby," "a preacher of politics," and in efforts, through *ex-parte* councils and other and similar devices, to oust him from his pulpit. The popular religious press, instead of hailing him as a prophet of Freedom and giving wing to his words of warning and rebuke, joins the clergy in efforts to destroy his influence. Even *The Independent*, while deriving pecuniary profit from the anti-slavery reputation acquired by the productions of his masterly pen, instead of manfully sustaining him in his struggles with a proslavery Ministry and Church, gives open aid and comfort to his enemies!

—Dr. Cheever was greeted, on Wednesday evening, by a large and enthusiastic audience, who voted by acclamation that they wanted to hear him again. He will, consequently, deliver another discourse on Monday evening next.

The discourse of Wednesday evening, "The Logic of the Word of God against Slavery," will appear in full in next week's STANDARD.

ANTI-SLAVERY PULPITS IN NEW YORK.

THE friends of the slave have occasion for rejoicing in the fact, that a religious society lately organized in this city has chosen for its pastor the REV. O. B. FROTHINGHAM, late of Jersey City and formerly of Salem, MASS.—a thorough-going, outspoken Abolitionist, in full sympathy with the American Anti-Slavery Society. The new congregation will be known as the "Third Unitarian" Society, we understand it to be the determination of preacher and people that the movement shall not be, in any sense, sectarian, but altogether free and untrammelled. The meetings of the new society will be held in the hall, corner of Broadway and Thirty-second street—seats free. The inaugural discourse of Mr. Frothingham, delivered last Sunday afternoon, was exceedingly appropriate and impressive. The hall was crowded, and many who came were unable to gain admission. We trust this society will be the nucleus of anti-slavery power in this city of cotton churches, cotton piety and cotton morals.

We learn, also, that still another free pulpit is to be immediately set up in this city, by the Rev. George R. Noyes, late pastor of the Unitarian Church in Chicago. Mr. Noyes repudiates every sectarian name, and hopes to gather a congregation of spirits kindred to himself, to whom he may be useful as a religious teacher. Our personal acquaintance with him is very slight, but those who know him well assure us that he is a man of true abilities and a writer and speaker. He has come to New York, not upon sufferance of any Church, but from a conviction of duty—a belief that this is the field appointed for him by Providence; and he proposes, we understand, to commence preaching at his own charge, trusting to God, in due time, all needed sympathy and support. The inaugural service, we learn, will be held in Hope Chapel to-morrow (Sunday) afternoon, at half-past 3 o'clock. Mr. Noyes will preach an anti-slavery gospel.

THE PERSONAL LIBERTY BILL.

ALBANY, April 7, 1859.

Hollis Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

On Wednesday evening the Assembly laid aside the regular order of business and took up the Personal Liberty bill, and went through with it, ordering it to a third reading (its virtual passage) by a vote of 65 to 16. The evening was occupied in debate, and it was until eleven o'clock. Mr. Hutchinson made a most convincing speech for the bill, as did also Mr. Laing, of Wayne, and Mr. Holt, of Wyoming. Mr. Laing's speech was one of the best in the whole discussion. He is evidently a strong believer in Lysander Spooner's theories. Brief remarks were also made by Mr. Powell, Mr. Perry and Mr. Schofield in favor, and by Mr. Warner, Mr. Weisant, Mr. Gover and Mr. Rutherford against the bill. The bill was amended by striking out the 13th section, which forbids any lawyer to act as counsel for the claimant of a slave. It was said that even murderers are allowed counsel, and it seemed but decent to allow a slaveholder what was allowed every other criminal. The amendment was agreed to without much opposition. I hope soon to chronicle its final passage in the Assembly.

The Republicans here were surprised to hear that Massachusetts had failed to come up to the mark on this bill; that your labors have eminently tended to establish these truths: First, that the Word of God in no degree countenances any system, law or institution constituting or recognizing slaveholding as a right; secondly, that a large portion of our own country; secondly, that Christianity is essentially, virtually, irreconcilably at war with such slavery, and that any true and pure Church is necessarily its antagonist; thirdly, that it is the imperative duty of the organized Christianity of the land to vote against such slavery, systematically, unfailingly, uncompromisingly, so long as the institution shall continue to exist. We, therefore, in testimony of our profound appreciation of your labors and sacrifices in the cause of Christian Purity and National Righteousness, respectfully invite you to be present, at such early day as your convenience may suggest, one or more of your recent discourses on the subjects just indicated, in the great hall of the Cooper Institute, where some thousands of our Christian brethren may share with us the interest and profit of hearing you.

We are, with profound esteem, yours,

[Ex-Gov.] Myron H. Clark,	Wm. Curtis Noyes,
John Jay,	[Rev.] H. Ward Beecher,
Wm. M. Evarts,	[Rev.] Thos. S. Hastings,
Isaac Bronson,	James Humphrey,
R. H. McCurdy,	Wm. Allen Butler,
[Rev.] Ed. H. Chapin,	Oliver Johnson,
Chas. W. Elliott,	John W. Edmonds,
Joseph Hoxie,	Chas. A. Dana,
T. B. Stillman,	S. P. Townsend,
Benj. F. Manierre,	Simeon Draper,
George William Curtis,	A. W. Morgan,
[Rev.] A. H. Burlingham,	[Prof.] Benj. N. Martin,
R. Hildreth,	[Rev.] T. Bourne,
Dexter Fairbank,	Henry A. Hart, M.D.,
R. W. Chester,	James O. Bennett,
Edward Gilbert,	Edwin West, M.D.,
Sydney H. Gay,	James Fairman,
Chas. T. Congdon,	Franklin J. Otterson,
Samuel Sinclair,	and others,

NEW YORK, April 1, 1859.

MESSRS. HORACE GREELEY, JOHN JAY and others.

GENTLEMEN: I am truly grateful for this kind invitation, and rejoice in the opportunity of acknowledging it, were it only to bear my respectful testimony to the truth of its principles, so admirably expressed. I am sure that, if we can get at the masses with the testimony of the Word of God against the iniquity of slavery, it will soon be swept from the land. I shall be most happy to respond to this request in one or more lectures, as may be thought best, commencing Wednesday evening, April 6.

Most respectfully and truly yours,

GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

Those who are familiar with the names of the clergymen and laymen who usually figure in the fashionable religious and philanthropic movements of the so-called evangelical denominations cannot fail to observe how few such names appear in this correspondence. The cry of the orthodox clergy heretofore has been, "Oh, we are as much opposed to slavery as anybody, but we can't join the abolition movement, because, in doing so, we must mix ourselves up with men whose religious views we cannot sanction." It would seem as if Dr. Cheever had been specially raised up by Providence to furnish a new demonstration of the hypocrisy of these men. Of unquestionable soundness according to the severest standard of orthodoxy, he is not in any way identified with the Anti-Slavery organization. Received as a theologian and of good reputation for piety, he stands forth as a minister of the Gospel to rebuke the nation for the sin of slaveholding and to plead with prophet-like eloquence the cause of the oppressed. Might we not reasonably expect the whole body of the evangelical clergy to rally promptly to the standard which he unfurls before them? And yet, they are not. Such is the fact. Of the Congregational pastors of New York and Brooklyn how many are ready to ask him to repeat his anti-slavery discourses? Henry Ward Beecher is the only one of them all whose name appears in the above correspondence. Of the host of Old and New School Presbyterian clergy only one signs the letter to Dr. Cheever; of the army of Methodist clergy not one; of the Baptists *one*, and he not by any means a representative of the Baptist denomination; of the Episcopalians not one; of the Reformed Dutch not one. Of evangelical laymen there are indeed some highly respectable names, but they are for the most part those which have been known in political anti-slavery movements rather than in the fashionable philanthropy of the Churches. The experiences of the gentlemen who did the work of soliciting signatures to the requisition upon Dr. Cheever would, we fancy, be very instructive. The simple fact is, that the efforts of Dr. Cheever to arouse the evangelical Ministers and Churches to a sense of the wickedness of slavery and the duty of testifying against it have thus far proved a failure. They have responded to him only as the Scribes and Pharisees responded to the preaching of Jesus; and if crucifixion were now the mode of punishing "fanatics" and "disturbers of the peace of the Churches," they would hardly shrink from nailing him to the cross, so bitter is their hatred of the truth he preaches. As it is, they can only exhibit their hostility in assaults upon his personal and professional reputation, in denunciations of him as "imprudent," "a man of one idea," "a man of one hobby," "a preacher of politics," and in efforts, through *ex-parte* councils and other and similar devices, to oust him from his pulpit. The popular religious press, instead of hailing him as a prophet of Freedom and giving wing to his words of warning and rebuke, joins the clergy in efforts to destroy his influence. Even *The Independent*, while deriving pecuniary profit from the anti-slavery reputation acquired by the productions of his masterly pen, instead of manfully sustaining him in his struggles with a proslavery Ministry and Church, gives open aid and comfort to his enemies!

—Dr. Cheever was greeted, on Wednesday evening, by a large and enthusiastic audience, who voted by acclamation that they wanted to hear him again. He will, consequently, deliver another discourse on Monday evening next.

The discourse of Wednesday evening, "The Logic of the Word of God against Slavery," will appear in full in next week's STANDARD.

ANTI-SLAVERY PULPITS IN NEW YORK.

THE friends of the slave have occasion for rejoicing in the fact, that a religious society lately organized in this city has chosen for its pastor the REV. O. B. FROTHINGHAM, late of Jersey City and formerly of Salem, MASS.—a thorough-going, outspoken Abolitionist, in full sympathy with the American Anti-Slavery Society. The new congregation will be known as the "Third Unitarian" Society, we understand it to be the determination of preacher and people that the movement shall not be, in any sense, sectarian, but altogether free and untrammelled. The meetings of the new society will be held in the hall, corner of Broadway and Thirty-second street—seats free. The inaugural discourse of Mr. Frothingham, delivered last Sunday afternoon, was exceedingly appropriate and impressive. The hall was crowded, and many who came were unable to gain admission. We trust this society will be the nucleus of anti-slavery power in this city of cotton churches, cotton piety and cotton morals.

We learn, also, that still another free pulpit is to be immediately set up in this city, by the Rev. George R. Noyes, late pastor of the Unitarian Church in Chicago. Mr. Noyes repudiates every sectarian name, and hopes to gather a congregation of spirits kindred to himself, to whom he may be useful as a religious teacher. Our personal acquaintance with him is very slight, but those who know him well assure us that he is a man of true abilities and a writer and speaker. He has come to New York, not upon sufferance of any Church, but from a conviction of duty—a belief that this is the field appointed for him by Providence; and he proposes, we understand, to commence preaching at his own charge, trusting to God, in due time, all needed sympathy and support. The inaugural service, we learn, will be held in Hope Chapel to-morrow (Sunday) afternoon, at half-past 3 o'clock. Mr. Noyes will preach an anti-slavery gospel.

THE BILL DEFEATED.

Correspondence of The Tribune.

The Personal Liberty bill had its final reading to-day and was lost. When the bill was reached in its ordinary course, Mr. Miller of Tioga, moved to recommit to the Judiciary Committee, with a view of obtaining the opinion of that body as to the constitutionality of the measure, which motion was seconded by Mr. Duryea of Kings, and opposed by Mr. C. S. Spencer. Mr. H. A. Lyon moved the previous question and the motion to recommit was lost.

The vote then recurring on the passage of the act, it was lost—55 Yeas to 44 Nays, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Abbott, Andrus, Batchelder, Bliss, Briggs, Bump, Chamberlain, S. S. Childs, Cobb, Cheney, Cole, Crooking, Crowley, Davis, Field, Godard, Grant, H. K. Graves, Green Hubbell, Hutchinson, Johnson, Laing, Littlejohn, Lockwood, Lyon, L. L. Lyons, Mallory, Marvin, McLeod, Moulton, Northup, S. S. Palmer, Parlin, Payne, Perry, Pease, Pixley, Pond, Powell, Searey, Riley, Rogers, Schofield, Sey, Shepard, C. S. Spencer, St. John, Sweeney, D. Thomas, Thompson, Tuthill, Van Horn, Weaver, Wiley, Winternute Woodbury—55.

NAYS—Messrs. Bowen, Brown, Christie, Clothing, Cowdrey, Duryea, Fleiss, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Gover, S. Graves, Hall, Hermance, Hosley, Jerminah, King, Leonard, Longwell, Lounsbury, McLeod, Mossmber, Mallory, Masterson, Meeks, Messercole, Miller, Morris, Nelson, Pendell, H. W. Sponer, Stewart, C. Thomas, Wardwell, Smith, Szuts, Sagdam, Tomlinson, Van Cortlandt, Van Valkenburgh, Weisant, Wiggins, Wilson, Woodruff, Young—44.

ABSENT OR NOT VOTING—Messrs. Carter called Rodgers—Messrs. Aylworth, Bingham, Burgess, Brockway, Bullington, Michael, Chandler, N. A. Childs, Clapp, Conzens, Collins, Cook, Dunker, Earll, Freeland, Faranon, Gardner, Hoit, Ladew, Law, Loomis, Morris, Nelson, Pendell, H. W. Sponer, Stewart, C. Thomas, Wardwell.

Republicans in Roman, Democrats in Italics, Americans in SMALL CAPS.

It will be seen that all the affirmative votes are Republican; also that sixteen Republicans voted No, as they had an undoubted right to do, and that fifteen Republicans dodged the vote, which is about the average number most sneaking thing of which a representative can be guilty.

It is proper to say that Mr. Holmes of Cortland voted for the bill on the call, but, seeing that it was lost for the want of the requisite number of votes (two-thirds of all the members elected to the House), he changed his vote in order that he might be in order to move a reconsideration, which he subsequently did. The great American party in the Assembly to a man either voted against the bill or did not vote at all. Mr. Law asked to be excused because he was not in his place when the question was stated. The gentleman from Delaware went out just before the Clerk had finished reading the bill, no doubt in order that he might have an excuse for not voting.

The defeat of the Personal Liberty bill before the Massachusetts Legislature had its effect, very likely, on some of our weak-kneed Republicans, and it is hard to believe that a few were unavoidably absent, who would have voted for the bill had they been present.

Mr. Opdyke asked to be excused from voting, and, in his statement of the bill, but could not "see how he could" believed it to be unconstitutional in some of its provisions. Gen. Duryea stated substantially the same thing, and was asking to be excused from voting. I don't know exactly what these gentlemen's opinion of the Supreme Court may be; but if they take the late decisions of the Supreme Court as their guide in such matters, it is utter twaddle and nonsense for them to say that they are in favor of the objects of this bill, or in favor of any bill which shall give a fugitive a fair opportunity to establish the fact that he belongs to himself instead of some white vagabond on the other side of Mason and Dixon's line. The only hopeful feature of this vote in favor of freedom is that it is larger than the one cast at the last previous trial to pass a similar bill, which argues that it is possible that New York may yet become a free State.

We are indebted to a friend for the following classification of the vote.

The vote in the Legislature on the Personal Liberty bill may be classified thus—Anti-Slavery Republicans, Pro-Slavery Republicans and Democrats, and Dodgers. Let us trot out a few of each.

ANTI-SLAVERY REPUBLICANS.

Among the true men we were glad to find Mr. BATCHELLER, of Saratoga, who, from some previous action on the bill, was misunderstood. Mr. S. S. CHILDS, of New York City, and Mr. ANDREWS, of Brooklyn, both voted Aye, Mr. SPENCER and Mr. TUTHILL of course voted the same way. These were all who came up to the mark from New York or Long Island. The SPEAKER gave his vote as he had his influence for freedom. PATRICK COSTELLO, of Oneida, a son of the Emerald Isle, deserves mention as having shown himself a consistent friend of the oppressed. Mr. LANE SWEENEY, of Niagara, also voted Aye. Others might be named among the affirmative votes equally deserving of credit for their bold and manly devotion to liberty. Fifty-six men were found ready to stand up for God and Humanity. Their names are recorded.

PRO-SLAVERY REPUBLICANS.

Mr. CONKLING, of New York, deserted his professions and his friends, being among the first to vote No on the Republican side. Mr. OPDYKE also failed, and of course Mr. TUTHILL followed the same way. Perhaps there are not enough anti-slavery in these gentlemen's districts to defeat them in another election, and so they can afford to do wrong. It is unnecessary to say they all belong to New York City. Gen. DURYEA, of Brooklyn, could not forget that he was a lawyer, and so let his manhood slide. Brooklyn, like New York, may overlook such turgiversation. But what shall we say of the few Republicans from the rural districts who played false—Mr. HALL of Essex, Mr. SLOCUM of Syracuse, and Mr. VAN VALKENBURGH of Columbia. We are content to leave them with their constituents—simply making a record of their votes. Of the Democrats who voted No, nothing need be said.

THE DODGERS.

Perhaps this class may escape a reckoning at home, and perhaps not. Mr. BROCKWAY, of Oswego, formerly in *The Tribune* office, led off in the flight from the Chamber when the bill came up. He is said to be an "habitual dodger." Closely following his heels were Mr. MORRIS of Yates, Mr. BINGHAM of Rensselaer, Mr. EARLL of Tioga, and Mr. EVELAND of Steuben, among the Republicans. The Democrats "fled almost *en masse*, led by Mr. LAW, of Delaware, who was brought back and excused from voting.

There were several other members who should have been brought in and compelled to vote Aye or Nay. It is but justice, however, to state that some were absent by saying they could not decide which way to vote—they were in favor of a bill, but not of *the* bill to secure Personal Liberty. Let them have the benefit of this.

Nine more voes votes would have passed the Act. These should have been obtained from the following absentees—Mr. Bullington, Mr. Collins, Mr. Holt, Mr. Loomis, Mr. Stewart, Mr. C. Thomas, Mr. Earll, Mr. Eveland and Mr. Brockway, most of whom inclined to the support of the bill; and the following, Mr. Hall, Mr. Morris, Mr. Slocum and Mr. Snell would have voted for it if they had obeyed the wishes of their constituents. Another year we hope this will be better understood.

—We hear, as we go to press, that the bill is likely, upon a reconsideration, to be amended and passed.

WANTED: *Backbone.*—Over every Legislative Hall these words should be inscribed. A bill came up in the Assembly on Friday morning, authorizing Oswego County to lease a portion of her Court-House to the United States. Mr. Hutchinson, ever true to his principles, moved to prohibit its use for the trial of Fugitive Slave cases. So just a proposition should have received every Republican vote. But it was lost, Ayes 52, Nays 32; as follows:

AYES—Messrs. Abbott, Andrus, Bliss, Brockway, Bump, Chamberlain, S. S. Childs, Cobb, Cheney, Cole, Crooking, Crowley, Davis, Field, Godard, Grant, H. K. Graves, Green Hubbell, Hutchinson, Johnson, Laing, Littlejohn, Lockwood, Lyon, L. L. Lyons, Mallory, Marvin, McLeod, Moulton, Northup, S. S. Palmer, Parlin, Payne, Perry, Pease, Pixley, Pond, Powell, Searey, Riley, Rogers, Schofield, Sey, Shepard, C. S. Spencer, St. John, Sweeney, D. Thomas, Thompson, Tuthill, Van Horn, Weaver, Wiley, Winternute Woodbury—52.

NAYS—Messrs. Bowen, Brown, Christie, Clothing, Cowdrey, Duryea, Fleiss, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Gover, S. Graves, Hall, Hermance, Hosley, Jerminah, King, Leonard, Longwell, Lounsbury, McLeod, Mossmber, Mallory, Masterson, Meeks, Messercole, Miller, Morris, Nelson, Pendell, H. W. Sponer, Stewart, C. Thomas, Wardwell, Smith, Szuts, Sagdam, Tomlinson, Van Cortlandt, Van Valkenburgh, Weisant, Wiggins, Wilson, Woodruff, Young—44.

ABSENT OR NOT VOTING—Messrs. called Rodgers—Messrs. Aylworth, Bingham, Burgess, Brockway, Bullington, Michael, Chandler, N. A. Childs, Clapp, Conzens, Collins, Cook, Dunker, Earll, Freeland, Faranon, Gardner, Hoit, Ladew, Law, Loomis, Morris, Nelson, Pendell, H. W. Sponer, Stewart, C. Thomas, Wardwell.

Republicans in Roman, Democrats in Italics, Americans in SMALL CAPS.

It will be seen that all the affirmative votes are Republican; also that sixteen Republicans voted No, as they had an undoubted right to do, and that fifteen Republicans dodged the vote, which is about the average number most sneaking thing of which a representative can be guilty.

It is proper to say that Mr. Holmes of Cortland voted for the bill on the call, but, seeing that it was lost for the want of the requisite number of votes (two-thirds of all the members elected to the House), he changed his vote in order that he might be in order to move a reconsideration, which he subsequently did. The great American party in the Assembly to a man either voted against the bill or did not vote at all. Mr. Law asked to be excused because he was not in his place when the question was stated. The gentleman from Delaware went out just before the Clerk had finished reading the bill, no doubt in order that he might have an excuse for not voting.

The defeat of the Personal Liberty bill before the Massachusetts Legislature had its effect, very likely, on some of our weak-kneed Republicans, and it is hard to believe that a few were unavoidably absent, who would have voted for the bill had they been present.

Mr. Opdyke asked to be excused from voting, and, in his statement of the bill, but could not "see how he could" believed it to be unconstitutional in some of its provisions. Gen. Duryea stated substantially the same thing, and was asking to be excused from voting. I don't know exactly what these gentlemen's opinion of the Supreme Court may be; but if they take the late decisions of the Supreme Court as their guide in such matters, it is utter twaddle and nonsense for them to say that they are in favor of the objects of this bill, or in favor of any bill which shall give a fugitive a fair opportunity to establish the fact that he belongs to himself instead of some white vagabond on the other side of Mason and Dixon's line. The only hopeful feature of this vote in favor of freedom is that it is larger than the one cast at the last previous trial to pass a similar bill, which argues that it is possible that New York may yet become a free State.

We are indebted to a friend for the following classification of the vote.

The vote in the Legislature on the Personal Liberty bill may be classified thus—Anti-Slavery Republicans, Pro-Slavery Republicans and Democrats, and Dodgers. Let us trot out a few of each.

ANTI-SLAVERY REPUBLICANS.

Among the true men we were glad to find Mr. BATCHELLER, of Saratoga, who, from some previous action on the bill, was misunderstood. Mr. S. S. CHILDS, of New York City, and Mr. ANDREWS, of Brooklyn, both voted Aye, Mr. SPENCER and Mr. TUTHILL of course voted the same way. These were all who came up to the mark from New York or Long Island. The SPEAKER gave his vote as he had his influence for freedom. PATRICK COSTELLO, of Oneida, a son of the Emerald Isle, deserves mention as having shown

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CCLXVI.

THE ARGUMENT.—The Correspondent shoutcth once—He reserveth the rest for when—He describeth the disadvantages of nurse-children—He draweth morals for the Republicans of the United States of New York Infant on the head—He crooketh the Nuk for the Know-Nothings—Where he intimatelh to voters—He consoleth Webster, Seward—He is prophetic as to the setting up and casting down of the northern image—He hopeth for the prolongation of the Boston House Purchases—He describeth it—He looketh forward to his own inhabitancy of the same, &c. &c. &c.

BOSTON, April 4, 1859.

HURRAH for you! Is Saul also among the Prophets? Can it be possible that you are going ahead of us here in the Bay State in your jealousy for Personal Liberty? It is almost too good to be true, and I will reserve the residue of my three times three—deducting the introductory cheer—until the bill has fairly passed out of the region of doubt and voting into the domain of fact and parchment. I am sorry enough that Massachusetts does not lead the Empire State in this glorious race, or at least keep up with her, but I shall rejoice exceedingly in your victory, though it is at the expense of distancing ourselves. We are defeated, but not cast down. We shall have all we want, one of these days. We have contracted such a chronic habit of having our own way that we can afford to wait for it a year or two. But then you must consider that your mighty mother has not a Presidential child or nurse in our ears has. Massachusetts political brats are always tetchy and wayward in their infancy, and often make no end of mischief in well-ordered political households, the direction of which, like other spoiled children, they are very apt to take into their own hands. Sometimes, to be sure, they get whipped and sent to bed, of which we had an edifying example in the case of the last political battling Mother Massachusetts had charge of, who cried for the moon and "broke things" that he thought might stand in the way of his getting hold of it—such as the Address for Removing Judge Loring and other Personal Liberty bill—but the stout old nurse not only tickled him for it, but mended up his breakages so nicely that they were better than new.

A noticeable feature in the defeat of our new Personal Liberty bill, of which you will doubtless give an account this week, is the weakness which it demonstrates to exist among some of the best kind of Republicans. As we must admit the honesty of the reasons given by such men as Messrs. Johnson of Abington and Wells of Greenfield, however much we may regret their wait and if sagacity, we are obliged to believe that they really thought they were doing the slave better service in voting against this declaration of his absolute freedom on the soil of Massachusetts than in carrying it through the House, which their votes and influence would have easily done. Now, as they could not possibly suppose that it was of any advantage to the slave to be carried back into slavery, if they had been able to escape from it more easily than it could be done under the provisions of that bill, it must follow that they thought that the damage done by it to the Republican party would be greater than the good done to the slaves, and that the success of the Republican party was the best thing that could happen for the slaves. Now, when I said just now that you had not a Presidential baby at nurse, I did not forget that New York has a nursling of her own—*non sine dis, animosus infans*—who may yet grow up into the Presidential stature, a good deal beyond the average of the later specimens, we will venture. But, then, we all know that he has his eye-teeth cut, and needs not to be spoon-fed with flapdoddle ("the stuff they feed fools on") of this sort. Or, to get down from my allegory, before the headstrong brute throws me over its head, he showed the difference between a statesman and a politician in the ground he took at Rochester. He *sees* that the only platform on which the North can overcome the Southern Democracy is a declarable Anti-Slavery one, with no rotten planks of expediency about it. Having made that platform, I presume he means to wait until the North is ready to come upon it, which will certainly not be next year. He will let Mr. Banks, or Mr. Crittenden, or Mr. Chase, break their political necks by falling through the rottenness of that "unworthy scaffold," and be ready to come in and take advantage of the experience which the Republicans will learn, if anything can teach them, by the almighty licking (speaking with the manner of kicked men) they are going to get from the Democrats next November twelvemonth. I think the young Massachusetts Republicans, in our House and out of it, would be wiser if they had sat at the feet of Mr. Seward and learned of him the true philosophy of politics.

But though our Republican House rejected the Personal Liberty bill, it was by no means idle. Not at all. It passed an amendment to the State Constitution requiring two years' residence as a condition of voting. And by this act has disgusted the German portion of the party all over the country—by no means the least sound or respectable part of it—so that they may throw some of the Western States into the scale of the Democracy. It was done as a sop to the Know-Nothings, of course, but it is not enough to satisfy them, while it has made the Germans cry out to disgust the really substantial foreigners. I can tell them, they have hurt the prospects of their party far more by this inensate folly than they would have done by enacting that every slaveholder coming into the State should be hanged without benefit of clergy. You know the Germans in Wisconsin sent in a remonstrance against this action, or have protested against it in some way. It has now to be submitted to the people, and, if it be not defeated, it will be a heavy and great blow to the government to the Republican party, next year. I expect myself to enjoy the rare pleasure of voting on that occasion. As it is a purely Massachusetts matter, and in nowise connected with the Constitution of the United States, I see no reason why we should not express our pleasure, in our sovereign capacity, as to this change in the fundamental law of the State. I shall not do this, you will easily understand, because I think it essential to the possibility of the success of the Republican party—though it may be—nothing less can save it from the desertion of its foreign legion—but because I think it morally wrong as well as politically absurd. As to the Republican party, I do not believe it will be good for anything until it has had one more good flogging—the rod for administering which is even now in pickle—which must inevitably awaits it.

And the Legislature has given us another boon besides this, to console us for the loss of the Personal Liberty bill—it has given us Mr. Webster's Statue! The impudent proposition of a hundred or two men of Mr. Webster's Retainers to make the State of Massachusetts lie down in the dirt along with him and them, which Governor Banks indorsed, has been accepted. It was managed very adroitly, so as to avoid debate, being brought on late at night and put through without many members knowing what was to pay. As one of its favorers was overheard to say, "it was a devilish good hit!" But I do not think there was spirit (or *spunk*, if you prefer the word) in the House to have made any effectual opposition had it been brought before us in the broadest daylight. Such is the strength of the social influences of a city like Boston on the tender nature of rural membership! So we shall have a grand Inauguration before long, with the Burns Guard at the head and the Sims Brigade at the tail, and an Oration by Mr. Everett—ceasing for a moment to go about with his hat for Mr. John A. Washington—in the middle, and the foundations of the brazen Man of the Seventh of March will seem to be established forever. But perhaps not. Though the villanous badness of the statue may be regarded as a qualified punishment at once of Mr. Webster and of the State, it will endure only for a season. The Anti-Slavery battle may be fought just as well over this *Websterolatry* as anything else. If I do not much mistake, Mr. Webster will be on trial for his later misdeeds before the Legislature for as many years as is necessary to dismiss his molten image from the pronaos of the Commonwealth. People thought we should never get Judge Loring turned out; but we did, and I rather think it will not take as long to get a joint resolution passed directing the sergeant-at-arms to take this intruder into custody and remove him from the premises of the State. And then we'll have a counter celebration—a *Disinauguration*, if there be such a word—and if there be not, we will coin it for the occasion, as medals are struck to commemorate great events. I flatter myself the Governor

my consent. but I wish you to take a seat there in the pew upon what I have said, and then decide.

These arguments, combined with her affection for her master's family, prevailed over her thirst for freedom, and she remained with him to the end of her days.

A few years after, she was seized with her last illness. On her death-bed her master addressed her to this effect, "Cœlia, did I not advise you well? You have now in your last sickness all the comforts and luxuries which my fortune can command, or that I would bestow on my wife or daughter. Are you not satisfied that you are much better off now than you would have been had you taken your freedom, as you wished?"

"No, sir," replied the slave, turning her dying eyes upon her master.— No, sir; for then I should have died FREE!"

I do not know whether others will deem these traits worthy of a record; but it appears to me, if these replies had been made by a Roman Matron, carried captive to Carthage, or into Pontus, historians would have inscribed them upon their pages, and Cœlia would have been as honored a name upon the lips of all posterity as those of Arria or Cornelia.

1840.

LINES

To those Men and Women who were avowed Abolitionists in 1831, '32, '33, '34 and '35.

BY MARIA CHILD.

[The reader will recollect how the fiery cross of Gian-Alpine was hurried through the land by messengers, who passed neither for joy nor sorrow, into one cry, till the signal had warned every chieftain of approaching battle.]

Ye glorious band! ye chosen few!
On whom God's Spirit came—
Endowed with heart so bold and true,
And tongues of living flame;

How memory kindles to review
The mighty work you wrought!
As the torch of Truth went swift struggling through
Contending doubts and fears.

That torch, like Alpine's fiery cross,
From mouth to mouth was borne;
Through deadly peril, pain and loss,
It lighted round the land.

Some saw the kindling watch-fires burn
From rivers to the sea,
And many died with weary pain to learn
Where all this light could be.

They heard the stunning roar and clash
Of elements combating;
They saw the burning glare and flash
She's secret caverns rending.

Then rose the fond discordant yell
Of selfish fears and power;
The light too strong upon them fell,
In God's own searching hour.

In civil garb, or priestly gulse,
The aged and the youth,
The proud and the worldly wise
Combined against the Truth.

Ye smiled to see the war they waged,
And scorned their rash design;
Ye knew how vainly Hell had raged
Against a truth divine.

Right valiantly ye kept your path,
And bore the banner up;
While roaring in tumultuous wrath,
The stormy waves rushed by.

Boldly ye sent the signal forth!
Nor followed the lie in vain;
For the South, answering to the North,
Responded it again.

Now the whole land is filled with light,
And covers come like dew;
God grant the torch may burn as bright
As when you saw it first!

In south, it somewhat grieves my heart
That the world is coming in,
With its polishing, prudent art
Of compromise and sin.

For oh, it was a solemn joy
That tide of zeal to turn!
A holy and a blest employ
To take those wind-fires burn!

God bless you with his love divine,
Dear brethren, tried and true!
And grant you may find your work shine
As when our names were few.

1837.

James G. Birney, James A. Thome, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Taylor, Angelina and Sarah Grimke, all anti-slavery lecturers and agents, from the slaveholding States.

SIMEON BROWN'S ORTHODOXY TESTED.

THE FAITHFUL MINISTER, AND HIS SLAVE-TRADING PARISHIONER.

[Among the readers of THE STANDARD there are, doubtless, not a few subscribers to *The Atlantic Monthly*, to whom the following extract from Mrs. Stowe's story, "The Minister's Wooing," will not be new; yet we couldn't resist the temptation to print it for the edification of the still larger number who are not likely to see it in that work. The minister whose fidelity is so admirably depicted by Mrs. Stowe is not a fictitious character by any means; the original of the sketch being none other than that celebrated theologian of the last century, the Rev. SAMUEL HOPKINS, D.D., of Newport, R. I.—*Ed. Standard.*]

"Let's have a shame it is," said Dr. H., "what a scandal and disgrace to the Protestant religion, that Christians of America should openly practice and countenance this enslaving of the Africans! I have for a long time hidden my peace—may the Lord forgive me!—but I believe the time is coming when I must bear my voice. I cannot go down to the wharves or among the shipping without these poor dumb creatures look at me so that I am ashamed—as if they asked me what I, a Christian minister, was doing, that I did not come to their help. I must testify."

* * * * * *

Mrs. Scudder considered the Doctor as a superior being, possessed by a lofty helplessness in all things material and temporal, but yielding to no one in the necessity of thinking and caring for him, and prevising the earthly and material aspects of his affairs.

There was not in Newport a more thriving and reputable hostess at that time than the slave trade. Large fortunes were constantly being turned out in it, and what better Providential witness of its justice could most people require?

Beside this, in our own little church, she reflected with about the deacon Brown, the richest and most liberal supporter of the society, had been, and was then, drawing all his wealth from this source; and rapidly there flashed before her mind a picture of one and another, influential persons, who were holders of slaves. Therefore, when the Doctor unexpectedly lifted his tremulous voice, he startled her to a sort of *tattooing*, supposed to be peculiar to royalty. She was an uncommonly handsome woman, of a strong mind and a true heart. She had, too, as good an education as was generally thought necessary at that period for women in any rank of life; that is to say, she had been taught to read and write. She received into her arms the members of a numerous family at their birth, and closed the eyes of many of them in death. She tenderly loved her master and his children, and was regarded by them rather as an humble friend than as a slave; but her high spirit could never become reconciled to her servile condition. The draught of slavery was still bitter, though commended to her lips by a kind and friendly hand.

Mother Cœlia would gather the little inhabitants of the nursery around her, and tell them how, at their tender age, she was literally taken by force out of her father's arms, and carried away into a strange land, and sold into hopeless captivity.

"I do not tell you these things, my dears," she would add, "to make you think hardly of your father for buying me; for he only did what everybody else does, and he has always been a good master to me; but when you grow up, don't you buy slaves."

"From that time," said my excellent aunt, "I have been an Abolitionist."

Cœlia, in the course of her pilgrimage, had been married, and had ten children, all of whom died young. One day, my aunt, when sitting at play by her side in the nursery, said in all the thoughtlessness of childhood: "Mother Cœlia, are you not sorry that all your children are dead?"

"No, my dear," she replied, turning quickly upon her; "no, my dear; I do not want slaves to live!"

Just before the revolutionary war broke out, when liberty was as familiar in men's mouths as it now is, and somewhat nearer their hearts, many of the slaves throughout New England were unreasonable enough to think that the principles which they heard daily maintained applied to black as well as whites, and unceremoniously helped themselves to their freedom. Of this number were most of the slaves of my great-grandfather. He was a zealous Whig; and, to the credit of his consistency, be it told, he took no measures for the recovery of his "property."

Cœlia had made up her mind to follow their example, when her intentions came to the ear of her master. He, in all kindness, expostulated with her on her determination. He told her he should make no opposition to her plan, if she chose to adhere to it; but he reminded her that they had grown old together; that she had ever received the kindest treatment at his hands; and he described to her the difficulties she would find in her situation, when entirely dependent on her own industry for support, compared with what it would be if she had him to look up to.

"I know very well," said he, "that you can get a good living in Boston as a cook or confectioner, as long as your strength lasts; but the time must soon arrive when you will be too old to work; and your health may fail before that time comes. In such an event, you must be left to the charity of strangers, or come upon the parish; whereas, if you remain in my service, you may depend upon being treated, in age or in sickness, with the same tenderness I would bestow on a sister or a daughter. If you persist in your intention of leaving me, I shall give my consent. but I wish you to take a seat there in the pew upon what I have said, and then decide."

These arguments, combined with her affection for her master's family, prevailed over her thirst for freedom, and she remained with him to the end of her days.

A few years after, she was seized with her last illness. On her death-bed her master addressed her to this effect, "Cœlia, did I not advise you well? You have now in your last sickness all the comforts and luxuries which my fortune can command, or that I would bestow on my wife or daughter. Are you not satisfied that you are much better off now than you would have been had you taken your freedom, as you wished?"

"No, sir," replied the slave, turning her dying eyes upon her master.— No, sir; for then I should have died FREE!"

I do not know whether others will deem these traits worthy of a record; but it appears to me, if these replies had been made by a Roman Matron, carried captive to Carthage, or into Pontus, historians would have inscribed them upon their pages, and Cœlia would have been as honored a name upon the lips of all posterity as those of Arria or Cornelia.

1840.

LINES

To those Men and Women who were avowed Abolitionists in 1831, '32, '33, '34 and '35.

BY MARIA CHILD.

[The reader will recollect how the fiery cross of Gian-Alpine was hurried through the land by messengers, who passed neither for joy nor sorrow, into one cry, till the signal had warned every chieftain of approaching battle.]

Ye glorious band! ye chosen few!
On whom God's Spirit came—
Endowed with heart so bold and true,
And tongues of living flame;

How memory kindles to review
The mighty work you wrought!
As the torch of Truth went swift struggling through
Contending doubts and fears.

That torch, like Alpine's fiery cross,
From mouth to mouth was borne;
Through deadly peril, pain and loss,
It lighted round the land.

Some saw the kindling watch-fires burn
From rivers to the sea,
And many died with weary pain to learn
Where all this light could be.

They heard the stunning roar and clash
Of elements combating;
They saw the burning glare and flash
She's secret caverns rending.

Then rose the fond discordant yell
Of selfish fears and power;
The light too strong upon them fell,
In God's own searching hour.

In civil garb, or priestly gulse,
The aged and the youth,
The proud and the worldly wise
Combined against the Truth.

Ye smiled to see the war they waged,
And scorned their rash design;
Ye knew how vainly Hell had raged
Against a truth divine.

Right valiantly ye kept your path,
And bore the banner up;
While roaring in tumultuous wrath,
The stormy waves rushed by.

Boldly ye sent the signal forth!
Nor followed the lie in vain;
For the South, answering to the North,
Responded it again.

Now the whole land is filled with light,
And covers come like dew;
God grant the torch may burn as bright
As when you saw it first!

In south, it somewhat grieves my heart
That the world is coming in,
With its polishing, prudent art
Of compromise and sin.

For oh, it was a solemn joy
That tide of zeal to turn!
A holy and a blest employ
To take those wind-fires burn!

God bless you with his love divine,
Dear brethren, tried and true!
And grant you may find your work shine
As when our names were few.

1837.

James G. Birney, James A. Thome, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Taylor, Angelina and Sarah Grimke, all anti-slavery lecturers and agents, from the slaveholding States.

SIMEON BROWN'S ORTHODOXY TESTED.

THE FAITHFUL MINISTER, AND HIS SLAVE-TRADING PARISHIONER.

[Among the readers of THE STANDARD there are, doubtless, not a few subscribers to *The Atlantic Monthly*, to whom the following extract from Mrs. Stowe's story, "The Minister's Wooing," will not be new; yet we couldn't resist the temptation to print it for the edification of the still larger number who are not likely to see it in that work. The minister whose fidelity is so admirably depicted by Mrs. Stowe is not a fictitious character by any means; the original of the sketch being none other than that celebrated theologian of the last century, the Rev. SAMUEL HOPKINS, D.D., of Newport, R. I.—*Ed. Standard.*]

"Let's have a shame it is," said Dr. H., "what a scandal and disgrace to the Protestant religion, that Christians of America should openly practice and countenance this enslaving of the Africans! I have for a long time hidden my peace—may the Lord forgive me!—but I believe the time is coming when I must bear my voice. I cannot go down to the wharves or among the shipping without these poor dumb creatures look at me so that I am ashamed—as if they asked me what I, a Christian minister, was doing, that I did not come to their help. I must testify."

* * * * * *

Mrs. Scudder considered the Doctor as a superior being, possessed by a lofty helplessness in all things material and temporal, but yielding to no one in the necessity of thinking and caring for him, and prevising the earthly and material aspects of his affairs.

There was not in Newport a more thriving and reputable hostess at that time than the slave trade. Large fortunes were constantly being turned out in it, and what better Providential witness of its justice could most people require?

Beside this, in our own little church, she reflected with about the deacon Brown, the richest and most liberal supporter of the society, had been, and was then, drawing all his wealth from this source; and rapidly there flashed before her mind a picture of one and another, influential persons, who were holders of slaves. Therefore, when the Doctor unexpectedly lifted his tremulous voice, he startled her to a sort of *tattooing*, supposed to be peculiar to royalty. She was an uncommonly handsome woman, of a strong mind and a true heart. She had, too, as good an education as was generally thought necessary at that period for women in any rank of life; that is to say, she had been taught to read and write. She received into her arms the members of a numerous family at their birth, and closed the eyes of many of them in death. She tenderly loved her master and his children, and was regarded by them rather as an humble friend than as a slave; but her high spirit could never become reconciled to her servile condition. The draught of slavery was still bitter, though commended to her lips by a kind and friendly hand.

Mother Cœlia would gather the little inhabitants of the nursery around her, and tell them how, at their tender age, she was literally taken by force out of her father's arms, and carried away into a strange land, and sold into hopeless captivity.

"I do not tell you these things, my dears," she would add, "to make you think hardly of your father for buying me; for he only did what everybody else does, and he has always been a good master to me; but when you grow up, don't you buy slaves."

"From that time," said my excellent aunt, "I have been an Abolitionist."

Cœlia, in the course of her pilgrimage, had been married, and had ten children, all of whom died young. One day, my aunt, when sitting at play by her side in the nursery, said in all the thoughtlessness of childhood: "Mother Cœlia, are you not sorry that all your children are dead?"

"No, my dear," she replied, turning quickly upon her; "no, my dear; I do not want slaves to live!"

Just before the revolutionary war broke out, when liberty was as familiar in men's mouths as it now is, and somewhat nearer their hearts, many of the slaves throughout New England were unreasonable enough to think that the principles which they heard daily maintained applied to black as well as whites, and unceremoniously helped themselves to their freedom. Of this number were most of the slaves of my great-grandfather. He was a zealous Whig; and, to the credit of his consistency, be it told, he took no measures for the recovery of his "property."

Cœlia had made up her mind to follow their example, when her intentions came to the ear of her master. He, in all kindness, expostulated with her on her determination. He told her he should make no opposition to her plan, if she chose to adhere to it; but he reminded her that they had grown old together; that she had ever received the kindest treatment at his hands; and he described to her the difficulties she would find in her situation, when entirely dependent on her own industry for support, compared with what it would be if she had him to look up to.

"I know very well," said he, "that you can get a good living in Boston as a cook or confectioner, as long as your strength lasts; but the time must soon arrive when you will be too old to work; and your health may fail before that time comes. In such an event, you must be left to the charity of strangers, or come upon the parish; whereas, if you remain in my service, you may depend upon being treated, in age or in sickness, with the same tenderness I would bestow on a sister or a daughter. If you persist in your intention of leaving me, I shall give

with a back full of wrinkles, and a sort of naive mouth—then, in her inspired silence, had been a voice to him, he had his hand on her head, and said—

"God bless you, child! 'Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger!'"

The Doctor went immediately to his study and put on his best coat and his wig, and, surmounting them by his cocked hat, walked matfully out of the house, with his gold-headed cane in his hand.

"There he goes!" said Mrs. Scudder, looking regretfully after him. "He is *such* a good man! but he has not the least idea how to get along in the world. He never thinks of anything but what is true; he hasn't a particle of management about him."

"Seems to me," said Mary, "that is like an Apostle. You know, mother, St. Paul says, 'in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world.'"

"To be sure—that is just the Doctor," said Mrs. Scudder; "that's as like him as if it had been written for him. But that kind of way, somehow, don't seem to do in our times; it won't answer with Simeon Brown—I know the man. I know just as well, now, how it will all seem to him, and what he will do the upshot of the talk, if the Doctor goes there! It won't do any good, after all, I doubt, it would be willing. I feel as much desire to have this horrid trade in slaves stopped as anybody; your father, I'm sure, said enough about it in his time; but then I know it's no use trying. Just as if Simeon Brown, when he is making his hundreds of thousands in it, is going to be persuaded to give it up! He won't—he'll only turn against the Doctor, and won't pay his part of the salary, and will be the upshot of it, the Doctor will be turned out, and our church will be broken up and the Doctor driven away—that's all that will come of it; and all the good that he is doing now to these poor negroes will be overthrown—and they never did have so good a friend, I doubt he would stay here and work gradually, and get his System of Theology printed—and Simeon Brown would help at that—and only drop words in season here and there, till people are brought along with him, why, by-and-by something would be done; but now, it's just the most imprudent thing a man could undertake."

"But, mother, if it really is a sin to trade in slaves and hold them, I don't see how he can help bringing it. I quite agree with him, I don't see how he came to let it go so long as he has."

"Well," said Mrs. Scudder, "if worst comes to worst, and he will do it, I, for one, shall stand by him to the last."

"And I, for another," said Mary.

"I would like him to talk with Cousin Zebedee about it," said Mrs. Scudder. "When we are up there this afternoon, we will introduce the conversation. He is a good, sound Christian, the Doctor thinks highly of him, and perhaps he may shed some light upon this matter."

Meanwhile the Doctor was making the best of his way, in the strength of his purpose to test the orthodoxy of Simeon Brown.

Honest old granite boulder that he was, no sooner did he perceive a truth than he rolled after it with all the massive gravitation of his being, inconsiderate as to what might lie in his way; from which it is to be inferred that, with all his intellect and goodness, he would have been a very clumsy and dangerous inmate of the modern American Church. How many societies, boards, colleges, and other good institutions, have reason to congratulate themselves that he has long been among the saints!

With this honest, plodding, and impetuous zeal, he was a truth and not act in logical sequence from it a thing so incredible, that he had not yet enlarged his capacity to take it in as a possibility. That a man should refuse to bear truth, he could understand. In fact, he had good reason to think the power of his townsman had no lesson to give to that purpose. That men hearing truth should dispute it and argue stoutly against it, he could also understand; but that a man could admit a truth and not admit the practical practice resulting from it was to him a thing incomprehensible. Therefore, spite of Mrs. Katy Scudder's discouraging observations, our good Doctor walked stoutly and with a trusting heart.

At the moment when the Doctor, with a silent uplifting of his soul to the throne of sovereign grace, passed out of his study, on this errand, where was the disciple whom he went to seek?

In a small, dirty room, down by the wharf, the windows veiled by cobwebs and dingy with the accumulated dust of ages, he sat in a greasy, leathern chair by a rickety office-table, on which was a great pewter inkstand, an account-book, and divers papers tied with red tape.

Opposite to him was seated a square-built individual—a man of forty, with a massive frame of bone, shaggy eyebrows, small, keen eyes, broad chest, and heavy muscles showed a preponderance of the animal and brutal over the intellectual and spiritual. This was Mr. Scroggs, the agent of a speculating, wholesale slave-trader, who had an order for a new relay of negroes to supply the deficit occasioned by fever, dysentery, and other causes, in their last year's stock.

"The Africs," said Simeon, "this last ship-load wasn't as good a one as usual; we lost more than a third of it, so we can't afford to put them a penny lower."

"Ay," said the other—"but then there are so many women!"

"Well," said Simeon, "women a'n't so strong, perhaps, to start with—but then they stan' it out, perhaps, in the long run, better. They're more patient; some of these men, the Mandingoes, partic'larly, are pretty troublesome to manage. We lost a splendid fellow, coming over, on this very voyage. Let 'em on deck for air, and this fellow managed to get himself loose and fought like a dragon. He settled one of our men with his fist, and another with a marlinespike that he caught—and, in fact, they had to shoot him down. He was a fine fellow, there's his son, too—fine fellow, fifteen year old by his teeth."

"What! that lame one?"

"Oh, he a'n't lame!—it's nothing but cramps from stowing. He knew, of course, they are more or less stiff. He's as sound as a nut."

"Don't much like to buy relations, on account of their latching up mischief together," said Mr. Scroggs.

"Oh, that's all humbug! You must keep 'em from stowing together. It's about as much as ever was, long time. There'll be wives and husbands and children among 'em before long, start 'em as you will. And then this woman will work better for having the boy; she's kinder set on him; she jabbers lots of Iugo to him, day and night."

"Too much, I doubt," said the overseer, with a shrug.

"Well, well—I'll tell you," said Simeon, rising. "I've got a few errands up-town, and you just step over with Mullock and look at the stock; just set aside any that you want, and when I see 'em all together, I'll tell you just what you shall have 'em for. I'll be back in an hour or two."

And so saying, Simeon Brown called an underling from an adjoining room, and, committing his customer to his care, took his way up-town, in a serene frame of mind, like a man who comes from the calm performance of duty.

Just as he came upon the street where was situated his own large and somewhat pretentious mansion, the tall figure of the Doctor loomed in sight, sailing majestically down upon him, making a signal to attract his attention.

"Good morning, Doctor," said Simeon.

"Good morning, Mr. Brown," said the Doctor. "I was looking for you. I did not quite finish the subject we were taking about at Mrs. Scudder's table last night. I thought I should like to go on with it a little."

"With all my heart, Doctor," said Simeon, not a little flattered. "Turn right in. Mrs. Brown will be about the house somewhere, and we will have the keeping-room all to ourselves. Come right in."

The "keeping-room" of Mr. Simeon Brown's house was an intermediate apartment between the ineffable grandeur of the parlor and that cozy retreat, the kitchen; for the presence of a large train of female servants made the latter apartment an altogether different institution from the throne-room of Mrs. Katy Scudder.

This keeping-room was a low-studded apartment, finished with heavy oaken beams of the wall left full in sight, boarded over and painted. Two windows looked out on the street, and another into a sort of courtyard, where three black wenches, each with a broom, pretended to be sweeping, but were, in fact, chattering and laughing, like so many crows.

On one side of the room stood a heavy mahogany side-board, covered with decanters, labelled Gin, Brandy, Rum, etc.—for Simeon was held to be a provider of none but the best, in his house-keeping. Heavy mahogany chairs, with crewel coverings, stood survey about the room; and the fireplace was flanked by two broad armchairs, covered with stamped leather.

To ushering the Doctor into this apartment, Simeon continued him to the sideboard.

"We mustn't make our discussions too *dry*, Doctor," he said. "What will you take?"

"Thank you, sir," said the Doctor, with a wave of his hand—"not this morning."

And depositing his cocked hat in a chair, he settled himself into one of the leathern easy-chairs, and dropping his hands upon his knees, looked fixedly before him, like one who is studying how to enter upon so inwardly absorbing subject.

"Well, Doctor," said Simeon, seating himself opposite, sipping comfortably at a glass of rum-and-water, "our views appear to be making a noise in the world. Everyone is talking about your volume; and when they appear, the battle of New Divinity, I think, may fairly be considered as won."

Let us consider that, though a woman may forget her first love, yet she cannot forget his own system of theology—because therein, if he be a true man, is the very elixir and essence of all that is valuable and in demand to the universe; and considering this, let us appreciate the solid purpose of our friend, whom even this tempting bait did not wave from the end which he had in view.

"Mr. Brown," he said, "all our theology is as a drop in the ocean of God's mighty sty, to whose glory we must be ready to make any and every sacrifice."

"Certainly," said Mr Brown, not exactly comprehending to what point the Doctor was tending.

"Now, Mr. Brown, I'm sorry to say, I have heard of some of your doings in this matter of the slave-trade, and I have felt that it was my duty to speak to you about it. I hope you will not take it amiss, but I felt it was my duty to speak to you about it."

"Well, sir, I'm obliged to you for your good intentions," said Mr. Brown, with a slight stiffness of manner