PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT
SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., OHIO.

JAMES BARNABY, Jr., *General Agent.*

BENJAMIN S. JONES,
J. ELIZABETH JONES, } EDITORS.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE:—Samuel Brooke, James Barnaby, Jr., David L. Galbreath, Lot Holmes.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. 2.---NO. 34. SALEM, OHIO, FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1847. WHOLE NO. 86.

☞ *All remittances to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper, to be addressed* (post paid) *to the General Agent. Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors.*

☞ TERMS:—$1.50 per annum, or $1.75 *(invariably required)* if not paid within six months of the time of subscribing.

ADVERTISEMENTS making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cents:—one square $1.

Printed for the Publishing Committee by
G. N. HAPGOOD.

From the People's Journal.

Memoir of William Lloyd Garrison.

BY MARY HOWITT.

(*Concluded.*)

We give below the conclusion of Mrs. Howitt's Memoir of W. L. Garrison. Owing to some delay in England, the number of the People's Journal containing it was only received within the week.—*N. S. Standard.*

The life of this truly great and good man has been so entirely devoted to the Anti-Slavery cause, that we cannot give a sketch of the one without tracing, in some measure, the progress of the other. The patience, the forbearance, the steadfast perseverance through good and through evil, the self-sacrifice, and self-renunciation, of the martyrs of emancipation, had drawn upon the cause the eyes of the whole country; and sympathy and conviction swelled their ranks every day, not with merely enthusiastic partisans, but with the most noble, the most intellectual, the most morally great men and women of the land.

In 1836, therefore, a new impetus was given to the Anti-Slavery movement, by the public labors of two remarkable women, who had become convinced of the guilt of slaveholding. These were Angelina and Sarah Grimke, the daughters of the Honorable Thomas S. Grimke, an eminent citizen of South Carolina. By the death of their father, they inherited a large amount of slave property. In opposition to the laws of their country, in the first instance, they endeavored to improve the condition of their slaves, by establishing schools among them, and introducing the habits of free society. But all their efforts were fruitless: the state of Slavery around them could neither permit nor make availing their humane labors. Sacrificing, therefore, their worldly interests to their conscientious sense of duty, they liberated their slaves, removed them to a free district, where they would be able to maintain themselves, and then, with the small remains of their once noble fortunes, came to Philadelphia; where, naturally allying themselves to the emancipation cause, they became the most active and influential of its movers.—They had also embraced the religious opinions of the Society of Friends, which, among other things, gives to woman a moral responsibility hardly acknowledged, at least, as far as action goes, by other religious bodies. They had thus been accustomed to speak in public, and their style of speaking was singularly impressive. Angelina, in particular, was a close reasoner and most eloquent declaimer. Before long, they conceived that duty called them to speak publicly on the subject of Slavery—that system which from experience they knew to have horribly imbruted more than a million of their sex—and they consequently began to travel, and deliver their public testimony, both as Christian women and repentant slaveholders, against the enslavement of any portion of the human race. They came to Massachusetts, which became the principal field of their labors. At first, they addressed audiences composed exclusively of women; but so general became the curiosity to hear them, that immense assemblies of both sexes gathered wherever they spoke, and the most electric effects were produced by their energetic and powerful eloquence.

Alarmed at this strange innovation, and deeming it a dangerous precedent to be set to the women of the United States, the Calvinistic clergy of Massachusetts, connected with what is called "The General Association," issued a *bull* against them, in the name, and by the authority, of the apostle Paul, and warned the churches to give them no countenance in their unscriptural course! They defended themselves with signal ability, and Sarah Grimke published an ably-written series of letters on the subject, entitled—"The Equality of the Sexes," which was the origin of what is called, in America, the "Woman's Rights Question," and which has become, as will be seen, mixed up with the emancipation movement. Of course, it was now necessary for the Abolitionists either to justify the course these powerful co-laborers were taking, or to join with the pro-slavery clergy in condemning and rejecting them.—The great body of Abolitionists, with Garrison at their head, bade them God speed! and thus established the principle of women being morally and politically equal to men.—The clergy of the "orthodox" stamp still continued to show the most hostile spirit to the labors of women and used every means in their power to get the management of the abolition cause into their own hands. They made a violent attempt at this in May, 1839, at the annual meeting of the "Anti-Slavery Society," in the city of New York, by denying that female members had a right to take part in the proceedings; but in this they were fortunately defeated. They then announced that, if the question was still carried in opposition to their views at the next annual meeting, they would secede from the society altogether.

The time of that meeting came, and will ever be memorable in the annals of the Anti-Slavery cause in America. The clergy had exerted every influence in their power to insure an overwhelming attendance of such as held their views of the question. The meeting was immense. The question immediately came on. Abby Kelley's name was proposed. She was a member of the Society of Friends, one of the most gifted and self-sacrificing of women, a noble creature in the noblest sense of the word, and one who has, since then, done more by her public lectures, and extraordinary labors, towards the overthrow of Slavery, than any other lecturer whatever. She is one of those who, in the unshrinking achievement of good works, deserved, and will obtain, immortal honor.—Such are the glorious women who have come forth in this extraordinary movement, clearly proving their own moral and intellectual greatness, whilst they undermine the strongholds of Slavery, prejudice, and self-interest. The question was—should Abby Kelley sit on the committee? A large majority of votes decided that she should, and the clergy and their adherents immediately seceded, went to another place, and organized a society full of deadly hostility to the old one, giving it the name of the "American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society." Their first endeavor was to brand the old society as a dangerous body; as one which ought to be discountenanced by every friend of good order and religion.—This new clerical society, unfortunately, like Elliot Cresson and his mission, has taken root in England, and has obtained the warm support of the Broad-street Committee, in London, which, singularly enough, is composed principally of the Society of Friends, who profess to hold, as one of their fundamental principles, the right for every human being to speak as the spirit giveth utterance, and who authorize, to the utmost, the right of women to enter the ministry, and speak in public. But truth is strong, nay, omnipotent, and these things must in the end be corrected.

No one individual in America has come in for a greater share of hatred and misrepresentation from this new and adverse party, than Garrison himself. It has been their object to crush him, and the violence of the Southern slave party has not been greater than the unkind, ungenerous falsehoods which they have circulated against him. We have heard, all of us in England, that he is a disturber of the public peace, a firebrand, an infidel, and on the last charge have the changes most successfully rung. An infidel! because he believes that not *one* day in seven, but that *all* days should be kept holy! Are not many of us infidels in this same sense? A disorganizer and firebrand, because he rejects the use of all carnal weapons, and inculcates the duty of literally overcoming evil with good, and forgiving our enemies, as we desire God to forgive us! May the day soon come, when not only he, but we and the whole world, are "disorganizers and firebrands" of this description.

In 1840, the so-called "World's Anti-Slavery Convention" was held in London, and Garrison was appointed by the American Anti-Slavery Society to attend it, together with Lucretia Mott, and other female delegates—Lucretia Mott, by way of parenthesis, let us observe, is another of those remarkable women who have been called out of the retirement of private life, to stand forth boldly in this great battle for human rights. Never will the writer of this article forget seeing for the first time this extraordinary woman. Lucretia Mott, to her idea, must be an Amazon who, if full of intellectual power, and moral intrepidity, would want yet the graces of the true woman. She came; she was not above the middle size; in the plainest garb of a Quaker matron; calm, gentle, affectionate, and womanly in the highest degree.—There was something absolutely subduing in the tenderness of her eye, in her soft smile, and low, pleasant voice; presently, however, the intellectual brow, the kindling eye, the beaming countenance, and the eloquent tongue realized an idea of intellectual and moral greatness, and singleness of purpose, which wanted no Amazonian figure to complete it. She is now the writer's idea of a woman of the apostolic age; and hers, in reality, are the true characteristics of mind which those apostolic days called forth, as well as the present great struggle in America. Such was Lucretia Mott; but she was a *woman*, and the World's Convention would not receive her; nor, of course, any of her sister delegates.

Garrison, as might be expected, refused, therefore, to appear in the character of delegate, either; not on the grounds of "Woman's Rights," but because the credentials given by the American Anti-Slavery Society were dishonored, and he would not allow himself to go in as a privileged member, where others, having the same credentials as his own, were excluded. To have done otherwise would, according to his views, have been false to that society, and to the cause of the slave. He went, therefore, merely into the gallery as a spectator.

Strong in many noble minds was the indignation felt at this exclusion, and Daniel O'Connell and William Howitt, each of them addressed letters to Lucretia Mott on this subject which were widely circulated in America.

The great question of entire and immediate emancipation, since then, has made rapid progress through the United States. The true spirit of American independence is showing itself amongst accumulating thousands who have awoke as from a lethargy, and are exerting their strength to throw off this incubus of crime, and this moral disgrace, from their country.

The object of William Lloyd Garrison, and his colleagues, Henry C. Wright and Frederick Douglass, in this country at the present moment, is to rouse the sympathies of the British population, and, knowing the influence which public opinion here exerts in America, to secure for this sacred cause the full benefit of this moral agent.

The struggle is an arduous one, but the hand of God is for it, and it must prosper.—Many remarkable features already attend it; it has called forth an amount of moral power and greatness, the effect of which cannot easily be calculated, but the result of which *must* be an immense march onward in the human progress.

Of our friend Garrison, let us conclude in the words of one capable of appreciating characters like his—"He is one of God's nobility—the head of the moral aristocracy.—It is not only that he is invulnerable to injury—that he early got the world under his feet, but that in his meekness, his sympathies, his self-forgetfulness, he appears "covered all over with the stars and orders of the spiritual realm whence he derives his dignities and his powers." He is, in short, a true disciple of Christ, and in this lies his power and his greatness. Such men ennoble their age and their country.

The American Peace Society offer a premium of $500 for the best *Review of the present War with Mexico.*

From the National Era.

The Constitutional Question--Anti-Slavery Men.

We proceed at once to notice the following resolutions of the State Liberty Convention of Massachusetts:

Resolved, That, to secure human rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed—but the power and scope of such governments cannot extend so far as to conflict with the natural rights of man, or be inconsistent with the principles of natural justice.

Resolved, That the Constitution of the United States does not establish slavery, nor give it any legal existence; nor does it, by any fair interpretation, sanction it, within the States. Nor could it so sanction it, even had its framers so intended, inasmuch as slavery had at that time no legal existence in any of the States of the Union: Because, first, the colonial charters did not authorize it. Secondly, the trade between the Colonies and Africa was never legalized by Great Britain. Thirdly, the decision of the Court of King's Bench, in the case of Somerset, in 1772, settled the law of the land, as applicable to the Colonies as to any part of Great Britain.—Fourthly, the Declaration of Independence, in 1776, became a fundamental law of the land, with which slavery was necessarily inconsistent. Fifthly, none of the Constitutions of the then States recognise it. And, sixthly, because slavery is inconsistent with natural right and justice, and its establishment lies beyond the limit of rightful constitutional and legislative authority.

The first resolution affirms, that "the power and scope" of a government founded upon the consent of the governed, "cannot extend so far as to conflict with the natural rights of man, or be inconsistent with the principles of natural justice." No comment upon this would be needed, were it not for the doctrine, recently broached by some, that law is no law unless it be a righteous one—a doctrine with no other force than that derived from a mere play on words. Whether the "power and scope" of such a government as that named above, can extend so far as to conflict with the natural rights of man, is a mere question of fact. The *right* to violate "the natural rights of man, or act inconsistently with the principles of natural justice," certainly exists nowhere. But that "the *power* and *scope*" (the last term meaning design or purpose) of such a government may extend so "far as to conflict with natural rights," is proved by the *fact*, that some fifteen Governments in this country are continually sanctioning and enforcing the violation of such rights.

"Ah! but they are not just Governments," it is said. True. Is it then meant by the proposition, that no *just* government can, in its provisions, "conflict with natural rights and the principles of *natural* justice?" This is a truism—a *just* government certainly cannot at the same time be an *unjust* one.

But it is the second resolution which deserves special comment.

It is often remarked, that it is unwise to make any concession to Slavery. So it is.—And not only unwise, but indefensible. But it is always proper to make concessions demanded *by the Truth.* An unsound argument or an erroneous statement, put forth against slavery, tends to strengthen its claims.

We agree with the declaration, that the Constitution of the United States does not establish slavery, or give it any legal existence. We go further, and affirm, that it confers no power upon the Government to establish slavery, or give it legal existence. Nor does it give *any legal sanction* to the system. But by no means do we assent to the position that "it could not have given such a sanction, even had its framers so intended;" nor do we admit the truth generally of the allegations made in support of this position.

1. As to the Colonial Charters, we shall say nothing about them, for we have no opportunity now to examine them. But, so far as we remember, they did not prohibit the establishment of slavery, and were not repugnant to it.

2. On what ground the *second* statement is made, we are at a loss to understand. The trade in slaves between the Colonies and Africa *was* recognised as a *legal* commerce—was sanctioned by the *Crown*—was perpetuated by the use of the *royal veto*, in opposition to the express will of some of the colonies. These are *facts* attested by history.—So far back as the year 1732, the Legislature of Virginia began to legislate against the foreign slave trade. The duties upon slave importation were increased, from time to time, till, in 1772, they amounted to above forty per cent. In the same year, a petition on the subject was presented to the Throne, from the House of Burgesses of Virginia. It says that the commerce in slaves had "long been considered as a trade of great inhumanity, and under its *present encouragement*," it threatened the existence of His Majesty's colonies. After showing that though some of his "Majesty's subjects of Great Britain" might reap emolument from it, it greatly retarded the settlement of the colonies," it concluded as follows:

"Deeply impressed with these sentiments, we most humbly beseech your Majesty to *remove all these restraints on your Majesty's Governors of this colony*, which *prohibit their assenting to such laws as might check so very pernicious a commerce.*"

How does this plain statement of facts consist with the declaration that the trade in slaves was never legalized by Great Britain? In the Constitution of Virginia, "the inhuman use of the royal negative," in refusing permission to exclude slaves from the colonies, was assigned as one of the reasons for separating from Great Britain. Besides, why was it found necessary to agitate so long and earnestly to procure a *law abolishing the slave trade* between Africa and the British dominions, if that trade was never legalized by Great Britain?

3. The third statement is, that "the decision of the Court of King's Bench, in the case of Somerset, in 1772, settled the law of the land, as applicable to the colonies as to any part of Great Britain." This cannot be true; else, why was compensation allowed by the British Government to ours, for slaves owned in this country, wrecked upon the Bermuda islands, before the abolition of slavery there? It will be recollected that our Government, with a pertinacious fidelity to the slave power, ever characteristic of it, demanded compensation for slaves in certain vessels, the Encomium, Comet, and Hermione, wrecked on the British West India islands, whereby the slaves were made free.—One of the vessels was lost prior to the act of abolition in the colonies; and for the slaves on board that vessel, if we recollect aright, compensation was awarded; the principle was thus recognised, that, the colonies being slaveholding, the decision in the case of Somerset did not apply to them. Compensation was denied in the other cases, because the transaction took place after the abolition of slavery in the islands.

4. It is said, fourthly, that "the Declaration of Independence, in 1776, became a fundamental law of the land, with which slavery was necessarily inconsistent." Doubtless slavery, in all its parts, is inconsistent with the Declaration of Independence; but where is the authority for saying that this became the *fundamental law of the land?*—The people of the colonies did not so ordain. Nothing in the Declaration itself gives countenance to this idea. The Supreme Court of the United States has never so ruled. The Constitution of the United States, behind which there is no higher authority than the ultimate sovereignty of the people, does not so recognise it. Let us not impose an agreeable fiction upon our own minds. That Declaration was put forth by the representatives of slaveholding colonies, not as a *law*, but as a vindication of their separation from Great Britain. In that they affirmed certain great principles as the foundation of all just government, and thereby came under a *moral* obligation to carry out those principles faithfully in their own case; but they did not ordain them as the fundamental law of the Government they were about to originate. Nor could these principles have any legal force over them, until declared to be law. When they came to form the Constitution, their language was this: "We do hereby ordain and establish this Constitution," &c. This is the fundamental and the only fundamental law of the land. We could wish it otherwise. We wish it could be said, with truth, that the Declaration of Independence had been ordained and established by our forefathers as the fundamental law of the land. But we cannot go beyond the record, and believe without evidence.

5. "Fifthly. None of the Constitutions of the then States recognised it." This is scarcely true. Several of the Constitutions of the States at the adoption of the Constitution, contained various provisions recognising indirectly the condition of slavery. For example, they provided that no "*free* man should be deprived of the right of liberty without," &c., and that every "*free* man" should be entitled to vote, &c. This certainly was a recognition of the fact that there were or might be slaves in those commonwealths, and excluded these slaves from certain privileges.

But, what matter if "the Constitutions of the then States" did not recognise it? The *laws* did. In fact, slavery was a part of the social structure. Slaves were first introduced into Virginia in the year 1620. They increased steadily from that time till, in 1776, they constituted a large portion of the inhabitants of the States. During all this period, *laws* were continually made, recognising them as slaves; and it does really *seem* like cavilling to deny, that what had been in existence for more than a century, was imbedded in the local institutions of a State, recognised and guarded by all its laws, and was a component part of the basis of its social system, was not *legalized*, because not written expressly in the Constitution!

In the year 1663, a law was passed in Virginia, by which all children born in the country "were declared to be *bond* or free, according to the condition of the mother." In 1667, it was declared that "the conferring of baptism doth not alter the condition of the person baptized, as to his bondage or freedom. This was done that the new masters, freed from this doubt, may more carefully advance the propagating of Christianity, by permitting their slaves to be baptized." In 1682, it was declared, that all "*servants* bro't into this country, by sea or land, not being Christians, whether Moors, Mulattoes, or Indians, except Turks and Moors in amity with Great Britain, and all Indians which should be sold by neighboring Indians, or any others trafficking with us, as *slaves*, should be slaves to all intents and purposes whatsoever." This act was re-enacted in 1705, and afterwards in 1753.

Here, then, are numerous laws ordaining the condition of slavery, dooming certain persons to that condition, establishing and perpetuating the slaveholding relation, which had already existed for more than a century under the guarantees of the law; and yet the assertion is made, that, at the time of the Constitution adoption, it was not legalized in a single colony! What is true of Virginia is true of all the colonies. It was legalized in Pennsylvania and New York. Else, why did Pennsylvania, and New York, and New Jersey, find it necessary to pass laws abolishing the condition!

6. "Sixthly. Because slavery is inconsistent with natural right and justice, and its establishment lies beyond the limit of *rightful* constitutional and legislative authority."—That is, slavery had no legal existence in any of the States of this Union, *because* its establishment lies beyond the limit of *rightful* constitutional and legal authority. We respectfully submit that this is a *non sequitur.* It would be logical to say that slavery has no *rightful* legal existence, because its establishment lies beyond the limit of *rightful*, constitutional, and legal authority; or that it has *no legal* existence, because its establishment lies beyond the limit of *constitutional and legal authority*; but, certainly, the premise—the establishment of slavery "lies beyond the limit of *rightful* constitutional and legal authority"—does not warrant the conclusion that it *has no legal* existence. For there are *bad* as well as *good* laws. There is *wrongful* as well as *rightful* constitutional and legal authority. An institution may be legal according to human enactments, and illegal according to divine enactment. In other words, the most *wrongful* systems and practices may be *legalized*, although that act by no means changes their character, or releases from guilt any one who may choose to support them.

☞ In closing, we would state, that we have on hand two communications—one sustaining the old, the other advocating the new doctrines. We shall publish the former next week, the latter the week after. A full comparison of views will be profitable. *We* only speak for ourselves.

Violence of the Abolitionists.

Extract from an able lecture, entitled 'Slavery forbidden by the Word of God,' by the Rev. David Young, D. D. of Perth, Scotland; delivered in Edinburgh at the request of the Free Church Anti-Slavery Society:—

Once more, they seek shelter in the violence of the Abolitionists. A preposterous plea! Are other men's sins an expiation for mine? But where are the violent among the Abolitionists? Do they name William Lloyd Garrison, the execrated of America, and, in some circles, at least, the maligned of Britain? Is he a violent man? Whose head has he broken? Whose house has he set on fire? Whose wife or children has he dragged into bondage? Whom has he instigated to do any thing more than assert the claims of justice and mercy? They call him an infidel: I do not believe it. His creed may differ, in some things, from theirs, or from mine, and yet remain the creed of a Christian; and if he be breathing the spirit of a Christian—if he be casting out devils in the name of Jesus Christ, what right have they to denounce him, because he follows not with them? Let his enemies beware; the sword they are wielding has two edges. If his measures be right, his mistakes in the faith can never make them wrong, and, if their measures be wrong, their soundness in the faith can never make them right. Orthodoxy is a sacred name, and, just because it is a sacred name, few things are more impious than attempts to turn it into a passport for cruelty. But has this hated and estimable man never been himself the victim of violence? He has; his character has been assailed; his person has been hunted like a partridge in the wilderness; a price has been set upon his head; his life has been put in peril; and by whom? By the emissaries of oppression—by assassins clothed in orthodoxy—by men, who, in the poet's phrase,

> "Are scandals to their times,
> Are at a loss to find his faults,
> And can't commit his crimes."

That the Abolitionists have never done any thing which was rash or out of place, I am not prepared to assert. It were marvellous—it were almost superhuman, if, amidst the difficulties which beset their path, they had never let go the reins of discretion; but suppose them to be as bad as their accusers call them, and their accusers as good as they call themselves, what is that to us? The cause of humanity is still the same; and it is surely better to help a bad man in a good cause, than to help a good man in a bad cause. And think of the provocation which these same Abolitionists had to endure. They found the churches fast asleep, and disposed to be angry when their sleep was disturbed; they found the holders and the tormentors of slaves retained in the fellowship, and even in the oversight of the churches; they found the ministers of the churches either speaking evasively, or positively defending the existing state of things; they found expedients eagerly resorted to, whose appearance was plausible, but whose aim was, at once, to frustrate their designs, and to impose on the simplicity of their friends. They found these things going on, month after month, and year after year; their sincerity was offended; their sympathies were shocked; their patience was worn out; and if they sinned against propriety in word or in deed, they did so in circumstances where charity forbids that 'every nice offence should bear its comment.'

Finally, the slaveholder tells us that we do not know their circumstances, else we would judge of them with greater leniency. But the tale is untrue. We do know their circumstances. We know that they have set up slavery, and are keeping it up by appeals to the record of our blessed Christianity.—We know them to be 'steeped in guilt.'—We know them to be treasuring up for themselves, and for their children after them, the vengeance of the Most High. We know them to be slaves, in their own persons, of the very worst description; for the physical bondman is not so vile as the moral bondman who has bound him. We know that the excuses which are ever on their lips, make nothing so manifest as their deep infatuation. In one word we know that the law of the Eternal is not, and cannot become, the creature of circumstances, but demands obedience, from all men in all circumstances, and in all places of the earth. Talk of their circumstances! Why, if there be a people under the sun, whose circumstances are favorable to the abolition of slavery, were their hearts but disposed to this, it is just the people of whom we speak. Is not the political suffrage wholly in their hands? It is. Can they not make or unmake their rulers as they please? They can. Even the man whose votes are many, because he is the holder of many slaves, is not bound by any law to give these votes in favor of slavery. Nay more, if all the professing Christians in the slave States were to unite against pro-slavery legislators, this, of itself, would be the beginning of the end; and humanity would not have long to wait to see the end consummated. Here, then, is a peculiarity in the circumstances of the slave States. In other countries, slavery is upheld by a military despotism, or under a constitution so mixed with the despotic, that the mind of the people is but partially expressed; but there, slavery is the will of the people—their free will; they have it, because they choose to have it; and so they stand alone among the nations of the earth in their guilt and their degradation.

Hearing before the Judiciary Committee.

The number of memorials that have already been sent to the Legislature of this State, for the peaceable secession of Massachusetts from this tyrannical and man-imbruting Union, is already considerable; others, doubtless, are in process of circulation for signatures, but they ought to be immediately forwarded, as the session is rapidly drawing to a close. Next week we shall endeavor to publish an accurate list of the whole number of petitions, with the aggregate number of signatures. From the small number of females who have signed these petitions, it is evident that they have generally supposed that the names of legal voters only were desired. This is a mistake. We have omitted to state, that, as soon as the first petition for Disunion was presented to the House, the Rev. Joshua Leavitt immediately sent another petition to that body, praying that the Disunion petition might be printed, with all the signatures attached to it. Whether the object of this Reverend politician was to terrify any body, (!) or to exhibit his zeal for the preservation of 'our glorious Union,' or to show that Liberty party men were still for an alliance with the southern men-stealers every reader must judge for himself. It was contemptible enough, beyond all doubt.—We are sorry to add, that the Rev. petitioner's request was not complied with by the House.

This afternoon, (Thursday,) at half past 3 o'clock, at the State House, the Judiciary Committee, to whom the Disunion petitions have been referred, will be addressed in behalf of the petitioners by Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison. What will be the report of that Committee, we will not attempt to anticipate; though, of course, we do not suppose it will be in favor of granting the prayer of the petitioners—for THE PEOPLE must first say the word, before their servants will obey; but we trust the Committee will not stultify themselves, and excite the laughter of all intelligent men, by imitating the 'patriotic' fools, alias the 'Select Committee,' of the Ohio Legislature, to whom this subject was referred, and whose ineffably silly and stupid report we have chronicled in the right place, to wit, our 'Refuge of Oppression.' In relation to the proposed divorcement between Northern liberty and Southern slavery, they ominously say—'The proposition is traitorous (!) and disloyal.—It is not a thing to be entertained or reasoned upon. The perpetuity of the Union should be assumed—regarded as a fixed fact, not to be debated or questioned'!! What trash is this! How disgusting is such servility to an instrument, which the Committee dare not deny contains the most iniquitous guaranties for the protection of slavery, and the support of which involves the people of the North in the guilt of the slave system! To propose a peaceful dissolution of the Union is TREASON, says this Committee. To oppose the war with Mexico, with the voice or press, is TREASON, says James K. Polk. The next step must be, to declare it a treasonable act to deny that slavery is 'the corner stone of our republican edifice'! But, treason, or no treason, our cry still is, and ever shall be—'NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.'

[*Liberator 12th of March.*

Mr. Adams.

We take the following from the Washington correspondent of the Pittsburgh Gazette. The voice of the "Old Man Eloquent" will not be heard much longer among us, but we rejoice that while it still lingers it speaks in behalf of liberty.—*True Democrat.*

The Civil and Diplomatic Bill, and the amendments of the Senate, occupied the attention of the House during the early part of the day, and again in the evening. Some of these amendments excited an earnest discussion, and particularly one appropriating $50,000 for paying the owners of the Spanish Schr. L'Amistad. Mr. Adams, who had not before spoken during the present session of Congress, and who could not now, but for the unanimous consent of the House, asked permission to speak upon this question.—Leave was granted, and the members clustered around the venerable member with the respect due to his years and his wisdom.—Mr. A. is very feeble, and during the two or three weeks he has been here has not before attempted to speak. His voice now was faint and his frame feeble. What he said was against paying the owners of the Spanish schooner a most unjust claim, as he regarded it. They were slave dealers and had deprived the Africans, who had been robbed of their liberty, of home and country.

They had violated Spanish laws in doing this. The men brought here were declared free by our courts. They were demanded by the Spanish Government, not as slaves, but as assassins and pirates. If either, they were not property; nor was any demand made for indemnity, until the courts had made these men free.

The committee of ways and means have recommended concurrence in this amendment, and the Senate passed it with great unanimity, but after the remarks of Mr. Adams, but 28 members were found willing to vote for the claim, and 94 voted against it.—Never were a few words productive of so much power. Such is the respect for the "Old Man Eloquent."