





PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

NEW ENGLAND

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION:

HELD IN BOSTON,

MAY 24, 25, 26, 1836.

---

BOSTON:  
PRINTED BY ISAAC KNAPP,  
46, WASHINGTON STREET.

1836.



## R E P O R T .

---

It is again our delightful privilege to congratulate the cause of down-trodden humanity upon another gathering of its boldest and firmest friends in the metropolis of New England. Of all the Anti-Slavery Conventions which have been held in Boston, this has been the most protracted, the most numerous, the most interesting, and probably the most important—thus demonstrating the steady and rapid growth of abolitionism throughout New England, its uncompromising character, and its lofty intensity of spirit, in despite of all hidden machinations, all mobocratic assaults, all legislative denunciations, and all ecclesiastical censures. It is thus our holy cause is 'put down' by its brutal foes! Put it down? Put prostrate colonization up! Eclipse the meridian sun with a taper! Bind the ocean with straws!

The Call to the Convention was very hastily sent out, at a late hour, to a few towns in each of the New England States; yet the number of signatures appended to it, exceeded *three thousand!* It is doubted whether a convention, for any purpose, has ever been invited to assemble by such an array of numbers, of moral worth, and of sterling patriotism. The list of names is widely before the public; and all may know, by examining it, something of the character of those who are battling against a bloody despotism, that the liberty of speech may remain untrammelled, that a free press may still be the palladium of our rights, and that all the oppressed in our land may go free.

About *five hundred Delegates* were in attendance, from every State in New England, constituting a portion of the benevolent, moral and religious *élite* of the land. Wherever they are personally known, they are recognized as the pioneers in every good cause—as the best friends of peace, of temperance, of moral reform, and of the gospel of Jesus Christ. In Convention, they were moved by one mighty pulsation—their hearts were indeed one, large and exhaustless as the ocean, and overflowing with sympathy and love.

The Convention was called to order, Tuesday May 24, 10 o'clock, A. M.

The Committee previously appointed to nominate officers for the Convention, reported SAMUEL FESSENDEN, of Portland, Maine, for President, who took the chair by unanimous vote of the Convention, and entered on his duties with pertinent remarks, expressive of his views of the object for which the Convention was assembled.

The Nominating Committee reported for the other officers of the Convention, the following gentlemen:—

#### VICE PRESIDENTS.

JAMES APPLETON, Portland, Maine.	ISAAC WINSLOW, Danvers, Mass.
DAVID STOWELL, Goffstown, N. H.	HENRY CUSHING, Providence, R. I.
JAMES MILLIGAN, Ryegate, Vt.	JOEL HAWES, Hartford, Ct.

#### SECRETARIES.

JAMES BALLARD, Bennington, Vt.	BENJAMIN KINGSBURY, Boston, Mass.
ORSON S. MURRAY, Brandon, Vt.	

#### TREASURER.

ORIN P. BACON, Dorchester, Mass.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE.

SAMUEL J. MAY, Boston, Mass.	IRA M. BIDWELL, Lowell, Mass.
DAVID ROOT, Dover, N. H.	JOHN G. WHITTIER, Haverhill, Mass.
WM. L. GARRISON, Boston, Mass.	ELIZER WRIGHT, Jr. New York City.
THEODORE S. WRIGHT, New York City.	

#### COMMITTEE OF FINANCE.

DRURY FAIRBANKS, Boston, Mass.	ORIN P. BACON, Dorchester, Mass.
WM. BROWN, Boston, Mass.	

#### COMMITTEE TO PREPARE ROLL OF CONVENTION.

NATHANIEL SOUTHARD, Boston, Mass. JOHN E. FULLER, Boston, Mass.

The Report of the committee was unanimously adopted.

A Hymn selected for the occasion was then sung.

Prayer by James T. Woodbury, of Acton, Mass.

MR. MAY, chairman of the Standing Committee, made a few introductory remarks. He said, that, at the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, held in this city a year ago, it was unanimously resolved to hold a similar meeting annually, until slavery shall be abolished throughout the land. A committee was accordingly appointed to make arrangements for the present occasion. That committee had attended to the duty assigned them. They had summoned the present meeting by a Call, signed by more than *three thousand* of their fellow-citizens—and were happy in having obtained, for the accommodation of their fellow-laborers in the holy cause of freedom, this spacious and convenient building.

He continued—Subjects of the highest moment would be brought under the consideration of this large and respectable body, during its ses-

sion, subjects relating not only to the condition of our enslaved countrymen, but to the liberty of speech, the freedom of the press, the dearest rights of freemen, which have been fearfully invaded since we were last together. He hoped the members of this Convention, and friends of the cause of both sexes, would give their attendance regularly at all the meetings which were to be held. Let it not be supposed, said he, that what we came here to do has been accomplished, when this meeting is closed. A few gentlemen, who have been particularly invited, will address the Convention this forenoon: but during the rest of the session, which will be of two or three days continuance, the subjects introduced are to be open for general discussion. We hope that all who feel disposed will speak freely. The subjects to be presented, will be of great importance to us all—not to the members of this Convention only—but to the whole nation, ay, to the whole world. A work we have taken in hand, which must be accomplished, or our country will be ruined. We have not come here again to lay the foundations of our enterprise, but to urge it on to its perfection. Every month, every week, almost every day brings some new facts to our knowledge, which reveals to us the necessity of lifting the standard of our principles still higher, and pressing forward with invincible determination. At this moment the question is pending in Congress, whether another slave State shall be added to this Union. And shall we, can we now be silent? There are thousands of slaves in the territory of Arkansas, who are now under the protection of the Supreme Legislature of the nation, whose chains might be broken in a moment by a decree of Congress. Shall we silently consent to see these suffering fellow-beings removed beyond the control of our National Government, out of the reach of the influence which the humane in the land may exert for their relief, through the representatives in Congress, and transferred to the government of a state, which in its *proposed Constitution, consigns them to hopeless bondage?* We cannot! We will not! Let a voice be raised in New England—the voice of indignant remonstrance, that shall be heard and felt throughout the land.

Again, sir, look at that contest which is going on in the territory of a neighboring nation. What is the ground of the quarrel between the emigrants from this country to the Texas, and the government of Mexico? What is that cause, in behalf of which the sympathies of the people of this republic are so earnestly appealed to? Why, sir, it is notoriously this. With a consistency which puts us to shame, the Mexican Government, (though a republic only in name) decreed, in the act of its formation, *that slavery should not exist in all its borders.* But our former fellow-citizens, who have settled in the beautiful province of Texas, have carried with them the abomination which has despoiled this republic of all its beauty, and in despite of the government which they are bound to obey, have persisted in holding slaves. To secure themselves in their wickedness they have gone to war, with the design of wresting Texas from Mexico, and attaching it to the United States. And now they are appealing to this country

to help them obtain their independence—that is to say, their independence of a government which prohibits slavery! Thus are the people of this country summoned, in this cry for independence, *to fight for slavery!* Shall we be silent? We will not, we cannot be! We will cry aloud against that false sympathy which is spreading through the land, and hurrying our fellow-citizens to fight against those rights of man, to which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

I mean not, Mr. President, to occupy the time of this Convention—but there is one subject more of vital importance, that will claim the attention of this body. I mean, sir, the fearful aggression that has been made the past year upon our own dearest rights—the liberty of speech, and of the press. What alarming demands have been put forth by the slaveholding States! What base concessions have been made by some of those that call themselves free! Even the Governor of Massachusetts has dared to intimate, in his inaugural speech, that his fellow-citizens, whose only offence is, that they have spoken and published their thoughts and feelings on the subject of slavery, have been guilty of ‘*a misdemeanor at common law!*’ Where is the spirit which once animated the people of this State? How calmly they have looked on, and seen this daring assault upon the palladium of our liberty! I have been surprised and alarmed, Mr. President, that this passage in our Governor’s speech did not call out from all parts of the Commonwealth a united burst of astonishment and indignation! But I trust, sir, that this and the other subjects to which I have alluded, will be spoken of as they should be by this Convention. Let those speak who have any thing to say, and all who have ears, let them hear. Our doors will always be open, and I hope, sir, these seats will be filled at every meeting of this Convention, that our fellow-citizens, whether friendly or unfriendly, may know what are the sentiments we cherish, and what are the means we purpose to use that we may accomplish the object at which we aim.

Mr. May rose again, by particular request, and held up two letters just received from our beloved brother George Thompson—and asked what should be done with them. A motion that they be read, was carried with enthusiasm. They were accordingly read. We give from them the following extracts.

‘GLASGOW, APRIL 30, 1836.

*My Dear Garrison :—*

Monday, 28th. I reached Newcastle at 3 in the afternoon, and at 7 in the evening, lectured on American slavery, in the large and beautiful chapel of the Wesleyan Methodists. Though the weather was exceedingly stormy and inclement, the audience was very numerous.

On presenting to British Christians, for the first time, the state of things in your Republic—the existence of slavery in its most loathsome forms, embracing nearly a fifth portion of your population—the internal slave trade—the awful desecration of the District of Columbia—the corruption of the churches—the anti-christian principles shamelessly avowed by ministers of religion—the outrages perpetrated during the last two years upon the persons and property of some of the noblest of your citizens—the attempts to annihilate the most sacred rights of social and political beings—and the



manifold and blighting operations of prejudice against color—when, I say, the vile oppressions which cover and curse your country are first revealed and attested by documentary evidence of the highest authority, the Christians of Great Britain start as from a trance, in which they had enjoyed visions of happiness, equality, and justice; and gaze with sadness, horror, and indignation upon the *real scenes* of inhuman tyranny, and lawless outrage upon the reputation, property and lives of all who are recognized as the vindicators of the injured. Here, however, let me observe, that in every lecture I strive to do full justice to America, by referring to the many noble and mighty institutions to which she has given birth, and to her unexampled and unbounded facilities for greatness and usefulness. In proof of this, permit me to observe, that one of the Newcastle journals, speaking of my lecture on the above evening, observed that I spoke of the United States in terms, which, if transferred to my own country, would be a high panegyric. I am not conscious of looking with one envious or narrow feeling towards your splendid, and I trust soon to be regenerated, free, and glorious country. My heart beats high with hope, that the shadowing mists of ignorance and prejudice, and the brooding darkness of cruelty and despotism, which have so long rested upon the land, will soon be dispelled by the bright beams of the Sun of Righteousness.

Tuesday, 29th. Had the unspeakable honor of being entertained as the advocate of the Negro, at a splendid tea-party, in the spacious Music Hall. About 600 persons were present. William Chapman, Esq., Banker, presided on the occasion. The widely known and justly beloved bard of Negro freedom, James Montgomery, Esq. was present, and delivered a thrilling address. It was a joyous evening, save when the pang of sorrow, the tear of sympathy, and the blush of shame, were awakened by the recital of the wrongs still heaped upon the victim of the white man's cruelty and scorn—the mangled and injured African. The refreshments, which were plentiful, delicious, and tastefully served up, were provided *gratis* by the ladies. The hall in which the festival took place, was *gratuitously* lent by the proprietor, and the entire purchase money of the tickets, besides a very liberal collection made at the close of my speech, given to the cause of negro education in the British West Indies. Gratifying as such meetings are, yet would I rather be sharing with you the labors and perils of a pioneer, than reaping the richest harvest of applause. Indeed, acclamations are becoming painful to my ears, and I am sighing for a region in which, if the atmosphere be less bright, it is, to a constitution like mine, more bracing.

Wednesday, 30th. By particular request, I occupied the Independent Chapel, and pleaded the cause of the London Missionary Society, with special reference to the society's operations in the West Indies.

Thursday, 31st. Attended a great meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society, at which the society was reorganized, and became the 'Newcastle-upon-Tyne Society, for the extinction of Slavery and the Slave Trade throughout the world.' The following, amongst other resolutions, were unanimously passed:—

“That this meeting views with the deepest abhorrence, the cruel and abominable system of slavery at present existing in several of the United States of North America, and the vile and odious distinction of color obtaining in them all, as not only revolting to the American Declaration of Independence, which affirms, ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created *equal*—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness; but also as being a direct and wilful violation of the Golden Rule of the Divine founder of Christianity, which enjoins, ‘Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them;’ and utterly repugnant to that religion, where there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, but all are one in Christ Jesus.

“That this meeting sympathises with their brethren in the cause of universal freedom in America, under the persecution to which they are subjected—it congratulates them on the rapid advances which the good work is making in defiance of the desperate attempts of their adversaries—it bids them God speed, and exhorts them to press onward; and desires to assure them that not only are they, in common with the rest of the human kind, and countless witnesses on high, anxious spectators of the conflict, but are wishful, if it be in their power, to lend them a brother's aid; and for this purpose they *solicit the commencement of a correspondence with them.*”

My reception wherever I have yet been, has been flattering and enthusiastic in the extreme. All denominations in the church, and all parties in politics, have united to heap compliments and kindnesses upon the persecuted and banished advocate of *freedom and equality in America.*

I have seen Dr. Cox. I met him at the committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society in London. I repeated my charges before his face—spoke even more strongly than I did on the platform at New York—looked to him for his explanation—but he *said nothing.* My reception by the Committee, the Dr. alone excepted, was


most cordial and satisfactory. In a future communication, you shall receive a full account—copies of the minutes, &c. &c. The Doctor will not be many weeks a member of the Committee. My report was received with great satisfaction, and my whole course in the United States *unqualifiedly approved*.

There are a great many important movements respecting American Slavery contemplated by various religious bodies in this country. In a few days, I go to Edinburgh, to attend a great meeting of the United Secession Synod—a body similar (only not an established body) to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. It is probable I shall go into the subject before the body, during its session—at all events, I shall lecture during the time, and have most of the ministers (360 in all) to hear me.

A word in reference to the cause on this side of the water. The Ultra-Abolitionists, of whom I, of course, am one, are bent upon the overthrow of the Apprenticeship System in the West Indies. We have obtained a Committee of the House of Commons, to enquire into the working of the system, and confidently believe that the disclosures will warrant an appeal to the country and Parliament for its immediate extinction. The committee will commence its work very soon, and we must be content to wait until it has completed it, ere we *agitate* again. I wish no committee had been asked, as the evidence already was sufficient. Since my return to Glasgow, after a meeting on the 4th of March, 30,000 signatures were obtained in *ten days* to a petition, praying for the entire freedom of the Negroes. *Mr. Buxton* and his party, however, thought it better to have a committee. The conduct of the apprentices, under their multiplied grievance—many of them worse than Slavery—has been above all praise—beyond our most sanguine expectations. In Antigua and Bermuda (where entire liberty was given) all has been, and is, flourishing and happy. Things are going on nobly in France. *Abdy* is our representative there, and is doing his work well. All the political journals, from republicanism to carlism, advocate emancipation. All true abolitionists on this side of the Atlantic, are willing to join hands with you in the grand effort to rid the world of Slavery, and the Slave Trade.

After having read the letters, Mr. May informed the Convention, that the London, Edinburgh, and Glasgow papers, recently received, confirmed the statements made by Mr. Thompson, and fully established the fact of his enthusiastic reception in Great Britain, on his return from this country, where he was hated, and persecuted, and even in danger of his life, because he plead so boldly here the cause of liberty! A gentleman, who has lately returned from England, is a member of this body, and will hereafter state what he has learnt of the feeling in that country on the subject of abolition, and respecting Mr. Thompson.

Mr. May alluded to the statement in Mr. T's letter, that in ten days 30,000 signatures were obtained to a petition to Parliament, praying for the immediate abolition of the Apprenticeship System in the West Indies. Mr. President, said he, see how much better they love liberty in that country than we do in this!—how much more engaged they are in the cause of the oppressed, than we are! It has been stated on the floor of Congress, and sneeringly reported in the newspapers of this city, that, after all our exertions the past year, the number of petitioners, for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, has not exceeded 36,000. In ten days nearly that number was raised in Scotland, for the abolition of a much less oppressive system. Let us, sir, redouble our exertions, therefore, and not be wearied in our efforts to wake up our fellow-citizens to a sense of their duty, until we have laid before Congress a petition, signed by *thirty-six hundred thousand* names, if so many be necessary to accomplish our purpose there.

Let me, he continued, call the attention of this audience to one more topic introduced in Mr. T's letter— the effects of immediate emanci-

pation in the West Indies. His statement is abundantly confirmed by the testimony of the Marquis of Sligo, Governor of some of those islands, and by the evidence which has recently been brought before the British Parliament, by Fowell Buxton. In those islands where the emancipation was entire and immediate, the happiest effects have followed. The freedmen have been quiet, contented, and industrious. This is a fact which should be proclaimed every where. Providence seems to be graciously teaching this nation, by the plainest lesson of example, that the way in which right and duty require us to go, will be safe and pleasant. We shall be wholly without excuse if we refuse to learn. In the West Indies we see before us, in contrast, the system of partial and gradual emancipation on the one hand, and the system of immediate and entire emancipation on the other. The results have proved the safety of obedience to the truths, on which the abolitionists of this country have based their enterprise; and have repelled the anticipations of anarchy and bloodshed so freely indulged and propagated by the opposers of this holy cause. Where immediate and entire emancipation from slavery was proclaimed, there have been no violence, no disturbances. Except, indeed, on the morning of their redemption, when the grateful freemen assembled by thousands, and with tumultuous, enthusiastic joy, shouted thanks to their earthly benefactors, and gratitude to God Most High. This is the only disturbance we have yet heard of. So entirely convinced are the philanthropists of Great Britain of the safety and duty of breaking the yoke of slavery at once—and of the unhappy operation of the Apprenticeship System, that Mr. Buxton has introduced a Bill into the House of Commons during this present session, to abolish that system wherever it exists. And the abolitionists of England are heartily cooperating with the abolitionists of this country, in the determination never to cease from our labors until, by the power of truth, and the blessing of God, this country, and the world are rid of slavery.

REV. MR. THURSTON, of Winthrop, Maine, offered the following:—

*Resolved*, That the retrospect of the past, the aspect of the present, the ground of our confidence and the source of our strength, urge us not only to persevere, but to increase our activity in the cause of universal emancipation.

The first branch of the inquiry proposed, in this resolution, leads us to a retrospect of the past. In casting our eyes back but a few years, we are struck with the extraordinary indifference which prevailed everywhere, to the appalling fact, that, notwithstanding we claim to be the freest people on earth, a great mass of the population existing in the midst of us, are slaves. This slavery, which has existed ever since our independence as a nation, had received but a small share of attention compared to the immense importance of the subject. And when, at last, some few minds began to be aroused and alarmed at the evils of slavery, as they contemplated the condition in which more than two millions of immortal beings were placed; and when they began to feel for them, and to

inquire what could be done to raise up our oppressed brethren to the possession of their rights as men, that the light of knowledge and of the gospel might be poured into their benighted souls, the inquiry was met at the very threshold with the cold-hearted reply, that it was a matter with which none but the masters of the slaves had any concern. It seemed to be almost universally admitted, that it was the duty of this whole people to disregard the claims of the colored race to the humanity and sympathy of Christians.

Such is the retrospect of the past. But when we consider what has been done, and in so short a time, what a change has taken place in the views of men; and especially when we look across the Atlantic and see what has been done by Great Britain for the slaves in her colonies, through the instrumentality of the same means, have we not every encouragement to go forward with new activity and higher hope?

The aspect of the present should encourage us. We have done more than we had a right to expect. When the New England Anti-Slavery Society was first formed, did the few who then came forward in the ranks anticipate that in 1836, such a Convention, from every state in New England, as we now see, would be assembled, peaceably, and undisturbed, in this city, and in such a house as this? Who could have anticipated such a dissemination of correct principles so widely diffused, as we now see from the evidences here and all around us. The subject is becoming one of universal attention and interest. The whole length and breadth of our country, the people are waked up to look at this great question of slavery, and a spirit is raised among them that can never sleep while a single slave exists in the land. It is a spirit impelling men to go mightily forward, in the strength that is from above, to the redress and relief of this wrong. The ministers of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ are waking up this spirit, and rousing themselves to the work. The discussion of the subject by Christians, and in the churches is producing important and valuable effects.

There is always a disposition to fall in with the current of the day, and adopt the prevailing opinions which lead off from the line of right, till men forget or disregard right itself, and look only at expediency. The principle of expediency, is the ruling doctrine of the age, and this principle of expediency is rightly defined to be the sacrificing of the principles of eternal truth and right, to the present emergency, and wherever right and wrong are made to depend on an emergency, this principle of expediency has obtained greatly, and put to sleep the consciences of men. By discussions of the subject, men will be led to see the inconsistency and absurdity of this doctrine of expediency, and hence it is that discussion is producing important and valuable effects. Many have been benefitted by it. It has led them to entertain more correct and sounder views in regard to the great principles of right and wrong. The cry heretofore has been peace, peace; peace in sin, for fear of raising the anger of sinners.

The multitude here seemed to understand, that, because the gospel enjoined peace, as one of the fruits of Christianity, there must be peace though every thing else taught in that gospel should be sacrificed to it. In practice they seem to understand that the gospel teaches the Christian that it is first peaceable, and then pure, so far as the impure will allow it to be, without quarrelling—that it is gentle, and then righteous, just so far as the unrighteous will let it be, without opposition. But this is not the doctrine of the gospel. We read that it is first *pure*, and then peaceable. As far as in us lies we must strive to live peaceably with all men—but we must not live with them in impurity. First pure, then peaceable. ‘There is no peace saith my God, to the wicked.’ It seems that this discussion is to bring us to the belief, that, in order to have peace with God as well as man, we must first have purity. It will be of little avail to build up a peace that has no sure foundation. We may erect a beautiful structure, but it will be based upon the sand, and in the day of trial it will fall. Discussion is doing wonders in the moral and religious world. We see what has been done by the discussion of the subject of temperance. It has awakened a lively interest in the question of right and wrong, as applied to the conduct of men and society at large. Other inquiries of the day have led to the like result. Discussion is the means to revive and quicken the moral sense, and impress upon the mind its individual responsibilities. So in the pursuits of business. If men want to get up an interest in a matter of commerce, or politics, they get the public together and discuss it. For this reason, we use discussion to get up an interest on this momentous question of slavery. None who are sure of being in the right ever fear discussion. Christians must discuss this subject of slavery, and test it by the standard of the oracles of God, and when they do that, thoroughly, the work will be done. If the seventeen thousand ministers of the gospel in the land were all to hold up this subject, and discuss it, it would produce all the change we desire to accomplish. And who will take it up, if the disciples of Christ will not? If they take a stand against the cause, it cannot hope to succeed. Why then should we be denied the right of discussion, or why should any complain of our use of it? It is as free for them to show our errors, as for us to point out theirs. Who would put an end to free discussion? What great moral reformation has ever been effected in our world in any other way?

Secondly. The ground of our confidence encourages us to go onward. What is it? Because the truth is mighty and will prevail, and our cause is based on truth and right. See what the truth has done in Great Britain, and what it is doing here, but I will not dwell on this. Again, we are encouraged by the source of our strength. What is that? Of ourselves we are weak. Without Christ we can do nothing. We must be guided by his Spirit. If we rely on him and go forward in the name of the Lord, he will succeed us, he will prosper us. The God of heaven is the avenger of the oppressed, and he regards the cry of the destitute. He it is who has given the promise, that the time will come, when every

yoke shall be broken, and the oppressed go free. Although we do not see this promise fulfilled now; although we see the petitions for the abolition of slavery in the district of Columbia disregarded, yet the seeds have been sown, and we know we have effected even there, more than could have been expected. Assured that a just and holy, and all wise God will prosper the work, it becomes us to do, not only what we have done, but all we can do; pledging our best efforts, exerting our talents, devoting our time, and offering up our prayers to Him who rules the armies of heaven and governs the nations upon the earth, that He will prosper our cause, and will so turn the hearts of men to justice and righteousness, that the laws which authorise one portion of our fellow-men to deprive another portion of life, liberty, and property, may be repealed, and all the oppressed be permitted to enjoy the rights, which God has given to the creatures of his power.

MR. H. B. STANTON, (Agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, formerly a student of the Lane Seminary, Ohio) rose to second the resolution, with great pleasure. The question was asked why we go on? why are we bound to persevere, and to increase our exertions in the cause of emancipation? Why do I oppose slavery? I answer, because I am a moral being. Abolitionists oppose slavery because they are moral beings; and because slavery is a war upon the happiness, the rights, and the interests of moral beings; a war not only upon the rights of man, but of angels—a war upon the rights of *Jehovah* himself; a war upon *being*, irrespective of the rights of all moral agency, whether of man, angels, or of God. I am unwilling to lower down the dignity of this subject to a mere struggle for the rights of man. It is a struggle for moral rights, in the broadest, widest, deepest, and most exalted sense.

Slavery is a war upon the rights and interests of man. What is the war that slavery makes on the slave's rights? The highest and proudest distinction given by God to man, is *rational being*. The Law of God, proclaimed in Genesis ix. 6, is 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.' Previous to this injunction, God permits man to kill the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, but in the 6th verse he interposes in behalf of the life of man. 'Whoso sheddeth *man's* blood, by man shall his blood be shed.' Why? Because, 'in the image of God made he man.' The beasts wear the image of the earth, and are earthly, and therefore made for man's use. But man, says *Jehovah*, wears *My* image, and partakes of the heavenly. What then is the sin of slavery? Making God's image *property*,—sinking it to the condition of a *thing*. Disregarding the distinction between rational and irrational creatures. Scaling the ladder of Heaven, and pulling man down to the level of the brutes that perish. It is God, and not abolitionists that instituted these inherent rights of man. He says that in his own image has he created man. What does slavery do? It profanes the image of God. It takes man, whom God has crowned with glory, and honor, and power, and transforms him to a beast, fetters his body with chains, and crushes his moral

being. God created man a king, and made him but a little lower than the angels. In sublime and solemn conference, it was said in the counsels of Jehovah, 'Let us make man.' Not till then did God take counsel in all the works of his hands. 'Let us make man, and let him have dominion.' God gave him a sceptre. Slavery takes it away, and lets man lord it over his fellow-man as if he were a beast. I cannot better express my views of slavery, than by quoting from a minister of the name of Harding, at the south, writing to a friend at the North. 'I wonder,' he says, 'how I could ever have apologized for slavery. It is the concocted essence of fraud, tyranny, and cold-hearted avarice.' That is the definition of slavery by one who had seen and known it for many years.

Slavery! Let that man practice it who can—I envy not his possessions, or his heart. Let that man apologize for it who can—I envy not his intellect or moral perception. Let those who can, refuse the claims of the slave to the rights of man, and denounce those, who in the name of humanity and of God, demand that the oppressed shall go free;—I envy not their hearts, or their intellects, for they dishonor God, in his image, and shut out men from their sympathies.

Slavery not only makes the slave a slave, but it destroys the love of freedom *here*. It makes war upon us at the North, as well as upon the rights of man, and the prosperity of the South. I regard it as a fixed principle, that slavery endangers liberty every where. The first principle of slavery is, that might makes right. Power can take the crown from the head of man, which God placed there, when he created him, and put a yoke upon his neck and fetters upon his limbs. And will it stop there? Already this same lawless power, which binds the colored man to slavery, calls for a gag to be put in our mouths. Give it that, and how long before it will put a yoke upon our necks? Slavery gives power to one man to seize another and sever him from all ties, all sympathies, all rights. Who is safe? Can you confine the operations of this principle to the black man? Already it has outlawed, in one vast section of our country, every man, white or black, who dares to say, he sympathises with the down-trodden slave. This great subject assumes an importance to which no man who loves himself or his country should be indifferent. It is directly the struggle between right and might; the right that not only claims to hold the slaves of the South, but to make the freemen of the North slaves; for what is it but to be a slave, if we cannot speak or write only what our masters dictate? The grand question at issue now is, whether the South have a right to hold us of the North in subjection.

O, it is all theory, says one—all exaggeration; the South asks no such thing. But what are the claims of the South? What are the demands of Gov. M'Duffie, that champion of oppression, the patriarch of slavery, the theologian of the slave school. He tells our governors and legislators to stop the mouths of free citizens who dare to talk against slavery. He tells us that we know nothing of liberty, because we have got no slaves, and that we must make slaves of our laboring men, or we cannot en-

joy freedom. He says that slavery is the proper condition of laborers, and that the colored race were made for slaves. He makes God a liar, who says, that of one blood created he all nations upon earth. God has set up a right which knows no distinction of race or color. 'As ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye unto them.' M'Duffie says he knows better than God. You must not do unto the colored man as you would he should do unto you. God commands the oppressor to break the yoke and let the oppressed go free. M'Duffie says, if you obey God, and set the slaves free, you will all become slaves; and for fear of this, he calls upon the Legislatures of the free states, to put a gag into the mouths of their citizens, lest they should talk off the fetters of the slave. *Theory?* Is this theory, when such demands as these are made to stop the mouths of those who shall dare to speak against *slavery!* within the sound of the hammers on Bunker Hill?

But the Union, the Union they say will be rent if we don't submit to the demands of the South, and consent to be the apologists of the sin of slavery. The Union rent?—it is rent already, and by slavery. What were the laws of the South against the citizens of the North, before this subject was discussed? As bad as they are now in fact, though less so in practice. What are they now? Are we not free citizens? and is not liberty of speech, and of the press, a part of that freedom which is guaranteed to us by the Constitution? Yet who of us that have dared to speak our sentiments against slavery can go to the South? I can't go to a Southern State, though I carry the Bible in one hand, and the Declaration of Independence in the other. The Union, the Constitution, the laws would be no protection to me. M'Duffie and the South assume to establish a set of principles, which every man must hold, or be banished from the South. You shan't come here, says the South unless you approve slavery, and you shan't talk against slavery in the North. Why? because it is an interference with our domestic institutions! And what has the South to do in this matter of interference in our domestic institution of liberty of speech? Why, she has plenty of work for our *governors* to do, and stands over them rod in hand, while they concoct their messages, calling upon the legislature to gag us in obedience to the demands of M'Duffie of the South! We have no right to interfere with the South, by talking about slavery. O, no! But it is all very right and proper, that we should be mobbed and gagged by the interference of the South with us!

The direct demand of the South upon the North is, that we should put down free discussion, by legislation. I rejoice, sir, that the slaveholders have brought the question there. The abolitionists began with advocating the rights of the colored man at the South; but now, when they deny to us the right of free discussion, they make our cause a defence of the rights, not of the slaves, but of MAN, bond or free. The question now is, whether slavery or free discussion shall triumph. Had we better have slavery, and surrender free discussion, or leave discussion to go on, to take the field and grapple with slavery, and let God speed the *right*? We ask



nothing but the right of free discussion. Give us that and we will put down slavery. The South may demand what they please; it matters not unless the North succumb to it, and the North cannot stop our mouths, without decreeing that all her citizens shall be slaves.

What has been done already at the dictation of the South? Look at the Church. At a meeting of the General Conference of the Methodist Church, held at Cincinnati, Ohio, the 9th of May, 1836, a memorial was presented by a Rev. gentleman, from the East, signed by 151 travelling and 49 local preachers, in all 200, praying for the restoration of the *original rules*, which prohibited slaveholding by church members. A like petition was signed by 2284 members of the Church. The subject was referred to a select committee, and what did they do? Reported resolutions which went to approve slavery, and denounce two of the ministers, members of the Conference, for attending an abolition meeting in Cincinnati. This was done by slaveholding ministers of Christ. Yes, sir, ministers of the gospel, under the terrible, soul-destroying influence of the sin of slavery, could rise in that Conference, and denounce two of their brethren for attending an anti-slavery meeting, as guilty of 'A DAMNING INIQUITY!'

Another branch of the Church, a Presbytery, I think, of South Carolina has passed a vote, ordering its delegates to retire, if the subject of slavery is discussed in the General Assembly. Sir, I am a Presbyterian, and by this proceeding must regard myself, with all the abolitionists, excommunicated from that body; but, I don't know that I shall grieve at this separation, when the sanction of that Church is thus to be given to bring a curse and a mildew upon us, by baptizing as holy the sin of slavery.

What are the pulpits doing in this cause? Apologizing for slavery, and denouncing and excluding those who preach up the doctrines of Christianity for the bond as well as the free.

What is the press doing? Eulogizing slavery, and calling together mobs to put down free discussion.

What are our Governors doing? Concocting messages to justify slavery, and calling it patriotism to shut our mouths, and let oppression have its way.

What were they doing in Faneuil Hall—the boasted Cradle of Liberty

\* Another member of that Conference, William A. Smith, said of the Rev. Mr. Scott, a member who opposed slavery, '*I would to God, he were in heaven, where he is prepared to go.*' Thus, in effect, wishing his brother were dead. If the desire of the eye can, as Christ tells us, commit adultery in the heart, does not this wish, that a brother were dead, commit *murder* in the heart? Mr. Smith must be a firm believer in the efficacy of the apology of Richard III., the crooked backed tyrant, for killing King Henry and Prince Edward. When the murderer is courting the lady Anne, whose husband and friends he had butchered, she reproaches him for the crime, and says—'they are in heaven, where thou canst never come.' To which Richard replies, 'Then should you thank me, gentle lady, who helped to send them thither!' Richard, no doubt, was as pious in his wish, as the Rev. Mr. Smith. He wished that those who stood in the way of his oppression of human beings, 'were in heaven, where they were prepared to go;' and so, in pure kindness, he helped to send them thither. Why should not Mr. Smith extend the same kindness to his beloved brother Scott! Lynch him!

in August last? Binding liberty for a sacrifice on the altar of Southern slavery, and calling on New England hands, to come forward and put the fire under.

What are men about—the laboring men of the free States, who, M'Duffie says, are *not fit to own their own bodies*? They too, are joining the mobs, at the bidding of those who tell them that every laborer ought to be a *slave*; and the man who comes forward to defend their right to be free-men, does it at the risk of fire and faggot—ay, and they are to be made to kindle it.

But our opponents have one argument, always at hand. Why don't you go to the South and preach up abolition? Don't talk to us, go to the South, there are no slaves here, why preach against slavery at the North? This was the answer of the evil spirits to Christ,—hast thou come to torment us before our time. Let us alone.

Why, sir, we have got a work to do here, to preach slavery out of the minds of the people of the North. The North is slaveholding in spirit! They justify and applaud the slaveholder, and denounce all who open their mouths, or wield a pen against slavery. At the command of the slaveholder, they trample under feet the sacred rights of liberty and free discussion, and set on the mob, to hunt down the man who dares to lisp a word to bring the slavery of the South into condemnation. Recreant New England! I am almost ashamed of the spot that gave me birth. Recreant land of the Pilgrims! which first received the footsteps of those who fled from oppression, that they might be free. Recreant land of Roger Williams, the Apostle of freedom of conscience and liberty of thought and speech. Recreant soil of Bunker Hill, which drank the blood of the Martyrs who died that we might proclaim 'All men are born free and equal!' O! thou hast crucified Liberty!

But they tell us that it is dangerous to discuss slavery. It is never dangerous to discuss Right. God made Right, and commanded men to seek for the Right. We must seek it in the light, by discussion, and not in the dark. Our Saviour speaks of a certain class of men who feared discussion and loved darkness rather than light. Why? because their deeds were evil—that was all. Discussion is light, and no man who has right on his side fears it. The man who is doing that which is wicked, seeks the night and shuns the day. He would not only put out the moon, but the stars also. So would the men who seek to cover the sin of slavery, put out the little light that free discussion is throwing upon that darkness.

But the excitement!—it produces great excitement! Well, there always is excitement, when truth combats with error. Who ever heard of great moral or religious reforms, or of any great good, without some soul, some zeal, some excitement? Excitement to get rid of sin is better than to go on sinning to get rid of excitement. Excitement is better than slavery. Excitement here, in this world, is better than the reproaches of the ruined slave in another world, for taking from him the Bible. In that day may he not say to you, you were a minister of the gospel, you were a

lawyer, you had influence, wealth, and power, and you neglected to plead for the slave, you left him to perish for fear of an excitement. God has declared that for such neglect he will call you to account in the day of judgment. Rather than meet such reproaches and be called to such account, it were better to toil like the slave through life, and go down to the grave in sorrow. Let us have an excitement, and let us bear the frowns of men, if in the day of judgment the brow of God will be placid.

Why don't you go to the South? I hear it said again by our opponents. Yes, men point with a dagger, and say, why don't you go to the South? They mean, why don't you walk into your grave? They know that at the South there is no law, no constitution, no country for the abolitionist. Let him step his foot on Charleston wharf, and be proclaimed a friend of the slave, and he is a dead man. Why is it so? Because the people of the North have libelled us as fanatics and incendiaries, and given the South the example to treat us as outlaws.

Why don't we go to the South? Because in your presses here in Boston, and your speeches in Faneuil Hall, you tell the people of the South, that the abolitionists are miserable wretches, unprincipled men, enemies to the South and to their country, who would apply the torch of the incendiary to the dwellings of the slaveholders, and the knife of the assassin to their throats.

Why don't we go to the South? Why don't we jump into a furnace, which the pro-slavery men of the North have kindled to consume us! No, sir. We must convert the North before we go to the South. We must convince the North that we are not what they have taught the South to believe us to be. We must bring back the lost rights of the citizen, under the Constitution, to equal protection and privileges in every State. We must wipe off the stigma, which the libels of the pro-slavery men of the North have fixed upon us, until the word abolitionist, shall no longer be the signal at the South for the cry, 'Seize him! Lynch him! Kill him!'

I am not speaking of slavery now, but of the rights of free citizens. If I talk strongly, it is because I feel that this spirit of slavery at the North would not only prevent us from freeing the slaves of the South, but would make us slaves. It shows that there is enough yet to be done to combat the slave spirit of the North, before we go to the South. But though we may speak in strong terms, we would appeal to the North in the language of persuasion and not of reproach, to raise them to a sense of duty, not to offend. We should not be discouraged though the multitude rise up against us. Discussion is going on and will go on. The public mind is probed; the moral atmosphere is beginning to be purified. We are but the humble instruments in the hands of God to that end. It is for God to say how and when the work shall be accomplished. Whether the Republic shall live or die, before the system is purified, is with God. It cannot live with the cancer of slavery preying on its vitals. But live or die, we will have the consciousness of doing our duty.

Why, what a stain is this slavery on our country; the boasted land of freedom, the pioneer of liberty; with our Declaration of Independence proclaiming throughout the world, that 'all men are born free and equal,' inviting the oppressed, from other lands to come hither and inhale the pure and elastic atmosphere of our Republic? And when they come, they behold a system of slavery pervading half the Union, which would not for a day, be suffered to exist in the old world. And for this, we are disgraced in the eyes of the nations of the earth, and must shrink before the rebuke of the greatest despot of Europe.

Send your ambassador to the Autocrat of Russia to expostulate with him on his cruel treatment of unhappy and down-trodden Poland. 'Where do you come from,' says Nicholas to the representative of us Republicans? 'From Republican America.' 'You feel for enslaved Poland,' says Nicholas; 'where did you come from?' 'From Republican America,' proudly answers the ambassador. 'Were you ever in the District of Columbia, the seat of your Government? Did you ever see man, the image of God, bought and sold there in the market like cattle? Are you a lawyer, and did you ever read the laws of your Southern States that make man a chattel, and take from him all the rights of humanity? And yet you come here to rebuke me for enslaving Poland! Thou hypocrite! thou child of the devil! go back to your Republican America, abolish your own slavery, and then come and talk to me of the subjugation of Poland! If that is liberty in Republican America, give us despotism!'

Sir, we boast of our efforts as a people, in the cause of Missions to convert the Heathen. But what can your Missionaries say when they go to preach the gospel to the New Zealander, the Caffrian and the Idolators of the East? 'Where do you come from,' they will ask of the Christian Minister? 'From Christian America, where the doctrines of this book of God, are taught in all their purity.' Is that the Bible, which you bring to us, and do you have that Bible in America?' 'Yes.' 'Were you ever in South Carolina? and is that the Bible which sanctions the slavery of South Carolina, and its laws against your colored citizens?' 'Yes.' 'Then carry your Bible and your philanthropy back again. Here even the victims to our religion do not throw themselves under the wheels of Juggernaut, unless they are willing. The widow does not mount the funeral pile to consume her living body with that of her dead husband, unless she is willing—we do not offer our aged parents or helpless children to the god of the Ganges, unless we are willing. But in Christian America you crush your victims under the wheels of the Juggernaut of slavery, willing or not; you tear the parents from the children, the children from the parents, and offer them up to the Moloch of avarice, willing or not. Go home, and first learn to practice what you came here to preach to us; give us paganism, if Christianity *sanctions slavery.*'

I am aware of the difficulties that surround slavery, but these difficulties are not created or increased by us. They are intrinsic. Suppose we

wait, these difficulties cannot be removed. The longer slavery continues to exist, the more the difficulties of removing it will increase. I am aware that some of our friends who are going to be on our side shortly, think we had better stop a little now, and see what will come of it, see if abolition won't be made easier, by letting slavery alone for a while. They tell us, 'here is this great giant slavery, with which you have been contending; you have made him stagger, he begins to falter under your blows, and now,' say our 'friends, just let him rest awhile. Feed him well, let him get refreshed and grow strong, and then we will join you and grapple with him again!' They tell us that there are not three millions of slaves yet; only let slavery go on till there are ten millions, and then what an easy and pleasant affair it will be to abolish it. Just take it up, some afternoon, as a tea party operation, and it is done! No, sir. We have fought too long and gained too much to give over, just as our adversary begins to grow weak after his most desperate struggles at resistance. Who would falter and turn back now?

'Who so base as he a slave—  
Who would be a traitor knave,  
Let him turn and flee.'

No, sir, though the rulers and the Governors are against us, though the Hierarchy denounce us, though the mobs are set upon us, in the name of God will we go forward, for it is God that giveth us the victory! The christian world is on our side. George Thompson, whom they drove from America for preaching liberty, is raising the abolitionists of Europe, and they will come to our aid. All the great moral and religious operations of the day will be brought to bear on this great question. All the moral elements, all the attributes of Jehovah are on our side, and shall we stop, and talk of delaying the work, till some more convenient season? I think, with Mr. Birney, that we have delayed too long. In five years more, says Mr. Birney, had nothing been done to arrest the progress of public opinion on slavery, the South would have been able to buy up and control the North, and treat them as slaves, if they dared to complain of slavery. No, sir, if we give over now, we yield forever. There will be no hope of averting the vengeance of Heaven from this devoted land, this land of boasted right, but practiced wrong. The clouds are gathering over us. The cry of the oppressed is ascending up to Heaven, and if God puts forth his hand against the oppressors, the clouds will burst on us in overwhelming torrents, and our sun will go down in endless night.

No! We must not stop. We must hasten our efforts. The subject of slavery is before the people. Keep it steadily there, with the broad light of free discussion pouring upon it, and exhibiting it in all its deformity. Would you put out the light of discussion? Suppose a thousand vessels, tempest tost, were hovering on your coast, at midnight and while one single light is guiding their course, some wretch should go and put out that light, and leave the vessels to be dashed upon the rocks?

Would he not be more than insane? And is not he so, who, when the fountains of the great moral deep are broken up, and reason and right are seen tossing to and fro in the tempest, should stretch forth his hand to put out the light of free discussion? No! let the light shine on, and it will bring us safe into that placid harbor where are universal peace and eternal emancipation. God fill our sails with propitious breezes—God give our vessel strength to breast the storm—God give her a gallant crew, and vouchsafe to place at her helm Him, who, when the tempest raged, said to the winds and the waves, peace, be still!

[The resolution passed unanimously.]

REV. JAMES MILLIGAN, of Ryegate, Vermont, proposed the following :

*Resolved*, That in carrying forward this great work, we must strive to act in accordance with the will of God.

Mr. M. enforced this consideration in a brief view of the duties of the Christian, in his relation to the question of emancipation. It was our duty, in all things, but especially in this great work, to direct our views to the glory of God. No matter how severely the momentary storm might beat upon us, if we relied on the promises of God, we should ultimately be brought to a safe haven. We must not be deterred by the frowns of men or the threats of the rulers, but like Moses and Aaron, standing before the hardened Pharaoh, lift up our voices, and cry to the slaveholder, let the people go, that they may worship God in freedom.

REV. THEODORE S. WRIGHT, of New York, [an educated black gentleman, the pastor of a Presbyterian Church in the city of New York, seconded the resolution. We give his language, as near as possible, precisely as he spoke, in order that those who doubt the capacity of the colored man, may, if they are candid, judge from the effects of a limited education, in the case of Mr. Wright, what might be done, if the colored race enjoyed the same means and incentives for intellectual culture as the whites. Mr. Wright is not merely a colored man, but a black man.]

Mr. President, (said Mr. Wright) were it not for the fact that humanity is suffering, and suffering in the race to which I belong—fellow-men of my own color; and were it not that I had been requested to speak, I should not venture to open my mouth in an assembly, where there are so many of my friends, so much better able to plead the cause of humanity. Sir, I am identified with two millions and a half of men, women, and children, whose minds, as well as their bodies, are chained down and crushed by slavery, and who have no power to speak for themselves. Every one of them, if their voice could reach my ears, would say—‘Speak for us!—Oh, plead for us!’ They would say, ‘Oh! if I were in your place, how I would speak and plead for myself, and for my fellow-sufferers.’ Let me then, sir, say a few words.

If the two millions and a half of slaves in these United States, could lift up their heads, bowed low, and look upon this assembly, and see the

noble spirits that are laboring in the cause of humanity, with the spirit of the gospel, they would exclaim, go on ; go on, in the spirit of the resolution, and as the big tears rolled down their cheeks, they would praise God for what he was doing for them, and learn to pray for grace to wait patiently till the time of their deliverance shall come. They would say to you, not to be discouraged—they would say to the professing Christians of this land, not to reproach them, but they would say, ‘the spirit of Christianity is the love of God, and God tells you, if you love him, to love your neighbor. We are your neighbors, and you see us down-trodden and poor, and blind, and naked : you see the spirit of oppression abroad, crushing our souls and bodies to the dust, and you hear God commanding you to go to the oppressors, and in his name to call upon them to undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free. We can’t do it. You have the laws in your hands. We must suffer and be silent—you can speak and undo the heavy burden.’ Yes, sir, this would be their language. I see their tears flow in gratitude, as you are ready to answer them, and tell them you are hastening to undo their heavy burdens. Yes, sir, it is true, thank be to God. We hope much from your agents, from the press, from your conventions, from all you are doing for us, but we hope more from God! The cause of emancipation is identified with prayer. Did you ever see an abolitionist without prayer? You have gone forth armed with prayer, in the spirit of the Prince of Peace. The whole land has been raised up against you, because you have labored to convince the oppressor, that he should no longer oppress. You have had to contend with a world in arms. Talent, power, wealth, the Government and the Church have all been roused against you. But, though you be persecuted even unto death, God is on your side, and he is stronger than them all. Christianity has gone forth, though Stephen was stoned, though Paul was imprisoned and mobbed, and the city in commotion. It cost life to spread the gospel, but blessed be God, life has not been taken here, in the cause of abolition. Yes, the friend of the colored man lives—blessed be God, *GARRISON lives!* To the uttermost parts of the earth, wherever the colored man can hear this, he will raise his hands to heaven, and say blessed be God, *Garrison lives!* I am speaking the language of the slave. I pray to be excused, if I am trespassing on any of the customs of society in saying this, in the presence of my friend, but I cannot help it. I know how the colored man feels. God has raised up Garrison for him, and blessed be God, he lives to plead his cause. Oh, it is impossible for you to tell how the heart of the colored man yearns toward those who plead his cause. You have never felt the oppression of the slave. You have never known what it is to have a master, or to see your parents and children in slavery. I was born in New Jersey. I knew a woman, the slave of the richest man in the place, and he was one of the judges of the land. He despised her entreaties, and would not let her go free. I pity him. They are both dead. I believe she is in heaven, but where he is God knows.

The slave has a friend in heaven, though he may have none here. There the chains of the slave will be knocked off, and he shall enjoy the liberty of the sons of God. We know that the influence of prejudice, and the love of power and avarice will oppress us here, and exclude us from privileges, on account of our color; but we know it will not exclude us from heaven, for God is no respecter of persons. Though we must be despised here, we know that our Redeemer liveth. We trust in God, who is able to save, all that come unto him. God speed you on! Go forward in his name, and you will prosper. I listen, and I think I hear the trump of jubilee sounding—I hear the voice of emancipation proclaiming to my down-trodden brethren, to stand up and be free! The strong efforts that are making, throughout the whole world, to abolish the slavery of my race, shall be accomplished. What do we hear from Europe, from South America, from every part of the world? The cry is, *emancipation!* it is liberty! and I as much believe the work will be accomplished, as if I now saw it with my own eyes. I want to see my brethren prepare for this. Slavery will be abolished, and I feel a great anxiety to prepare by brethren, by moral and religious instruction for this great change. Go on! If you suffer martyrdom, you will suffer in a glorious cause. Did not all the pioneers of Christianity suffer martyrdom but one? Some of you may be called to suffer martyrdom—your blood may be spilt, but I repeat it, it will be shed in a glorious cause. It will be like the blood of the martyrs. That was the seed of the Church, and this shall be the seed of liberty to the captive. I will detain you no longer. [The resolution passed.]

After singing a Hymn, the Convention adjourned till 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Committee having reported the roll of the Convention, it was

*Voted*, That all gentlemen present, who wish to take part in this Convention, and who are friends of the abolition of slavery in our country, be invited to become members.

MR. CHARLES BURLEIGH, of Connecticut, offered the following:

Resolved, That the Statesman and *Official* of the North who appeals to our patriotism to induce the surrender of the right of free discussion, deserves severer rebuke, and sterner exposure than the slaveholders of the South.

It is not, said Mr. Burleigh, with any reference to political purposes that this resolution has been offered. It refers to no party, but to the principle involved in a recent appeal from a distinguished individual, high in office,\* to the patriotism of the abolitionists, to give up the right of free

\* Referring to the address of his Excellency, Governor Everett, to the Legislature of Massachusetts, Jan. 1836, in which he says of the discussions on slavery—'The patriotism of all classes of citizens must be invoked, to abstain from a discussion, which, by exasperating the master, can have no other effect than to render more oppressive the condition of the slave; and which, if not abandoned, there is great reason to fear, will prove the rock on which the Union will split.'



discussion. When such an appeal is made to any body of citizens, they are bound as friends of their country, to respond to it, or to give their reasons why they will not.

An appeal from a high source, is made to our patriotism—for what? That we should take care that the republic receives no detriment? No. This is not the kind of patriotism invoked. Is it that we should be vigilant in the cause of freedom, and ever ready to defend our liberties? No. Is it that we should see to it, that the bulwarks of our free institutions are well defended, and the strong holds of human rights carefully watched? No. Nothing like this. But it is an appeal to freemen to slumber over slavery;—an appeal to the champion of the rights of man, to lay down his weapons and let the wrong triumph—an appeal to the Christian and to the patriot to be silent in the midst of sin and oppression!

And who is it that makes this appeal? The statesman, high in power. And what is his duty to his country? To take care of the safety of the republic, to keep pure and bright the flame of liberty, to throw himself in the breach, and be foremost in calling on others to come to the rescue of the *right*.

And what are the circumstances and the times under which we are thus appealed to, from high places, to surrender our birthright, and in the name of freedom, forfeit the name of free men? It comes at a time when the fundamental principles of liberty are openly assailed by the enemies of liberty, who are relying on their power, to silence discussion, and by threats, and force, and violence to bring the whole land under the yoke of their servitude.

What are the principles advocated by the men in high places? It has been proclaimed at the North, and echoed at the South, (for the North has put on the livery of abject submission to the South,) it has been proclaimed here, and it is echoed there, that the *people* are not capable of governing themselves. We are told by the great men of the South that we have nothing to do but to choose between a system of English Aristocracy or Southern Slavery; that we must have slavery in order to preserve freedom—and here we are told, by the great men of the North, that we must surrender free discussion, for fear it will prove the rock on which the Union will split! Yes! give up free discussion or give up liberty, that is the doctrine. And shall we suffer it to go forth unrebuked, and under the high sanction of the Statesman of the North? Shall it be permitted, silently to sink into the public mind, as the continual dropping of water wears a stone. Shall such doctrines go forth until it is impressed on the public mind that our only alternative is Aristocracy or Slavery; for what is slavery but the surrender of our rights?

Why give up free discussion? For what is the appeal made to our *patriotism* to give it up? Because free discussion is opposed to slavery and displeases the slave master. This is the reason we must give it up. Yield it to the masters of slaves, and thus become ourselves slaves. Did

the fathers of the Revolution teach such doctrine as this? What were their notions of free discussion? Did they ever appeal to patriotism to surrender free discussion? And shall we, when free discussion has made us a free, prosperous and intelligent people; shall we abandon free discussion and call it *patriotism*? Patriotism! If my country were invaded and I should counsel the defenders of liberty, to dismantle their forts, to spike their cannon, to lay down their arms, turning their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks, who that believes in defensive war would not denounce me as a traitor? And if you would call me traitor for that, what would you say of him, who tells you to cut off the right arm of the defence of all free institutions—*discussion*? And such is the demand of those who call on you in the name of patriotism, to give up free discussion! Whence do you derive the blessings of free government, liberal institutions and the religion that you love? Is it not all the fruit of free discussion? Who gave it but God himself, when he said, ‘LET THERE BE LIGHT AND THERE WAS LIGHT.’ This is free discussion—moral light. What the atmosphere is to the earth, as the medium through which alone can be conveyed the rays of light, and the warmth of heat, such is free discussion to the moral world. Give me the liberty to defend truth, and I fear not error. Better that error should be defended by discussion, than that there should be the silence of despotism. Let truth and error talk face to face, and error will shrink away. Free discussion is the cause, or if not the cause, the medium of all we boast of as distinguishing us from the savage. What but free discussion gave us christianity? Free discussion which neither powers nor principalities, nor persecutions, nor prisons, could put down, in the mouths of a carpenter’s son and twelve poor fishermen, overwhelmed the false philosophy of the schools, and refuted the learning of the disputers. Free discussion razed the foundations of error, and built thereon the truths of the gospel; and the same free discussion, though in weaker hands, will overturn the foundations of any other error, slavery itself, and build thereon liberty, and peace, and the law of love.

I do not propose to tell of the old triumphs of christianity through the power of free discussion; I come to the present times, for now is the time when the intellect of man is reaching forward to perfection in all things; now is the time to try all things, prove all things and hold fast that which is good. The great question is pending, whether America shall become what she has pretended to be, a free country, whose atmosphere cannot be breathed by a slave. We are fast losing sight of the first principles of liberty. We have forgotten the first lesson of freedom, that all men are born free and equal. We see all around us, the church, the legislature, the pulpit, the press, the forum, the mob, all warring against moral Being. Is this the time to abandon free discussion?

We may be told that we are only asked to suspend it, and that to suspend the exercise of a right is not to abandon that right. But the neglect of a right, and especially of such a right becomes equivalent to its

abandonment. Yield it once, and how will you get it back again? It is no abandonment of the right of locomotion to stand still. But if, while the enemy is rivetting fetters on your feet and shackles on your hands, and putting a cord about your neck; if then you should stand still, you abandon the right forever. Such is now your condition, if you yield to this appeal to your patriotism, to stand still in the cause of emancipation. The fetters are forging for your limbs, the shackles are fitting for your hands, the cords are twisting that are to bind the living body of Freedom to the dead body of Slavery forever. And at such a time, *patriotism* is appealed to, to stand still, and let the work of destruction go on. It is openly proclaimed from the high places, that the old doctrine of equal rights, as laid down in the Declaration of Independence, is merely 'a rhetorical flourish'—that the rights of man are only an abstract principle, and universal liberty, but an impracticable theory. And wherefore should patriotism abstain from discussing these great questions? Because slavery is a delicate subject, and free discussion the rock on which the Union is to split! Now, sir, we hold that slavery is the rock on which the Union will split, and not free discussion, and that the appeal should be made to patriotism to abandon slavery, and not to abandon free discussion. It is slavery that lies at the bottom of the excitement, and not the discussion of it. The South threatens to dissolve the Union, and therefore the North must surrender free discussion to pacify the South. This is the doctrine—and whenever the North asserts any of her rights, the South has only to stand up and threaten disunion, and then our Statesmen of the North tell us to abandon our rights for fear of dissolving the Union. This is a weapon which we put into the hands of the South to be used always to put down the North. We can't even discuss any thing that displeases the South. We can't discuss slavery now, they say, because there is an excitement. We can't discuss it when there is no excitement, because it will make excitement. Slavery can't be abolished, unless it is discussed and examined and the different measures compared; but it never must be discussed, and therefore no plan ever can be devised to abolish it. This is the doctrine of the appeal to patriotism to abandon discussion.

We say to the South, if you claim the right to demand of us to abandon free discussion, we claim the right to demand of you to abolish slavery. If the demand of the South is acceded to, where is your Bible? The South need only say that they will dissolve the Union, if we dare to whisper in their ears, that God has made of one blood, all the nations upon the earth. You cannot read the Bible from your pulpits, you cannot read the Declaration of Independence, and where will you be, if you go on yielding to this demand to abandon free discussion? Are you prepared to concede the point that the Declaration of Independence is a falsehood, and the Rights of man a mere abstract idea? To concede this is to concede our freedom; and hence we say, that he who calls on us to abandon free discussion is more to be censured than he who openly

justifies slavery. Why? Because he who justifies slavery discusses it himself, and thus admits the right of discussion to those, who condemn slavery, and this is all we want. We complain of no man for defending slavery, *if he will leave discussion free*. There we are willing to meet him. Let discussion go on, and as soon may you look for a bank of January snow to last till July, as for slavery to continue ten years in this country. It must melt and disappear before free discussion.

Let us bring the law of God to bear upon it—and force upon the conscience of the master how slavery violates that law. The commandment says, honor thy father and mother—the slave is not allowed to hate father or mother! The commandment is, thou shalt not commit adultery—slavery acknowledges no tie of marriage. Let us bring this system of slavery, with all its abominations, to the test, and it cannot stand.

He, then, who stands up to defend Southern slavery, is indirectly the ally of emancipation. We want the argument. Give me an open enemy, rather than a secret foe, who pretends to be my friend. Give me a man, who honestly defends slavery, openly and boldly, rather than one, who, pretending to be the friend of liberty, counsels the worst of slavery, and calls it *patriotism*: who gives us soft words, and at the same time, fetters our limbs, and palsies our tongues.

If, in these days, and at this time, any man, in high official station, can demand of us to surrender free discussion, and call it patriotism, I ask, if he is not more deserving severe rebuke, than the open advocate of slavery? Is he not more an apostate to the principles of liberty, a recreant to the cause of humanity and freedom, which he professes to love?

Mr. President, I have done. If, in these views, I have contended for any thing that is erroneous, or that has the appearance and not the substance of argument, I wish it may be exposed to the test of the freedom of discussion I have advocated. Let it be free discussion *for* us, or free discussion *against* us, but give us *free discussion*.

[The resolution was modified, by consent of the mover, by striking out the word *official*, and passed unanimously.]

Mr. MAY, of Boston, offered a resolve, that an effort now be made to raise *ten thousand dollars* for the cause. He said, that this resolution would test the sincerity of the preceding vote, by calling for the means to carry it into effect. At the late anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society in New York, it was voted to raise *one hundred thousand dollars*, in aid of the cause. Who would say that this was too much to devote to such a cause? Think of the millions pining in bondage, within the reach of that moral influence, which, through our operations, we may exert for their deliverance? What would not any one of you give for the emancipation of a brother, a sister, or a child! Think of those who are in bondage as your brethren, and then say, if you can, that ten thousand dollars is more than you ought to raise. The applications for lecturers all over New England were incessant. As much as it gratified him to hear these calls, his ears were pained with requests made for

lecturers, with which the Society had not the means to comply. It was the same in New York. And shall we do less the coming year, or no more than we have done the past year. Onward! Onward! is the word, till the work is done. We, at the North, are as deeply interested in abolishing slavery as is the South; for if slavery is not abolished, liberty will become extinct.

Let us show to our fellow-laborers in New York, that the spirit of New England still thrills in our bosoms. He had the pleasure of informing the Convention, that *one thousand dollars* was already pledged by a gentleman he was not at liberty to name, toward the proposed sum of ten thousand dollars. The sums that should be pledged by individuals or societies, were to be paid in, during the current year. A new incentive is given to renewed efforts, by the attempts to stifle free discussion, which have been violently made the past year, even in this metropolis; attempts which were but feebly opposed by our men of influence and power, and which have, in effect, been half excused in the inaugural speech of the Executive of this Commonwealth, referred to in the resolution just adopted. It certainly indicated an alarming depreciation of true New England feeling, that the appearance of the speech of the Chief Magistrate of this Commonwealth, affirming, 'on respectable authority,' that free discussion, by abolitionists, was 'an offence against this Commonwealth, which may be prosecuted as a misdemeanor at common law,' did not raise universal indignation throughout New England. What have abolitionists done, that that gentleman should hold us up to the world as felons? What have we done but utter our thoughts and feelings? And has it come to this, that in New England, the birth place of freedom, we cannot talk *against slavery*, without being threatened with an indictment as felons? If freemen cannot talk against slavery, without being indicted, upon what subject shall we not be forbidden to speak? Sir, I was astonished at this declaration in the Governor's annual speech, and the more so, that it was not met with universal indignation, not for the love of abolition, but for the love of freedom. Such an expression, I hope, will go forth from this Convention, and that our determination to maintain free discussion, will be made manifest by the promptness with which we respond to the call for the means to send forth lecturers, and publications on all the great topics connected with the cause of liberty! impartial liberty!

REV. MR. MILLIGAN, of Vermont. My opinion is, that this expression has gone forth, and has been expressed in the vote we have just taken. But I would have that expression sustained, by all the means in our power. Sir, I hold to free discussion, for error as well as truth. I admit the right, even of a governor, to talk nonsense and utter blasphemy against liberty. The error has gone forth; let the truth follow and expose it. Sir, the expression of indignation, at such doctrines, has gone forth and will continue to go forth.

MR. BURLEIGH. We trust that it will be such an expression as will ring through the country. Let it ring in the ears of the people, like the gold that falls into your Treasury, to be used to knock off the fetters of the slave.

MR. H. B. STANTON. They tell us we have done nothing, and can do nothing. Let us go on, and test whether we can do any thing. All we need, in order to abolish slavery is, to bring the testimony of public opinion, which is now in favor of slavery, against it. How is this to be done? There are several stages to go through in this holy war upon slavery. What have we been doing? The first thing to be done, was to wake up a man. The Lord waked up one man, and he waked up others, and they waked up the people to see the true tendency of the Colonization Society. Thank Heaven, that is laid to sleep—that work is done. This is one stage of the war. The next is, to meet and overcome the pro-slavery spirit of the North. That battery, which is now pointed against us, must be taken and turned against the South. Sir, we have not got at slavery yet. We have been battling with Faneuil Hall meetings, with the presses, the mobs, the governors and legislatures of the North; and when we can get them right, by convincing the people of the North; then with truth, humanity, the Bible, the whole North, and God on our side, we can look slavery into annihilation.

And have we done nothing? O, yes, sir! They thought they had mobbed us down in the cities; but while they were voting us into non-entity, our lecturers were in the country, waking up the lion of the woods to roar upon them. (Applause.) We have formed 530 anti-slavery societies in three years, and 300 of them were formed last year, while the mobs were going on. The American Anti-Slavery Society issued over 1,000,000 publications the past year.

We must not stand still in the cause. To stand still is to go backward. We must go on, or the country is gone, as sure as God is the governor of the nations. We want lecturers. There is not one in Maine, but one in New Hampshire, one in Rhode Island, one in Connecticut, one in Massachusetts, and but one in New York, with her two millions. True, he is a host, Theodore D. Weld, and has got a voice like a cataract, but he can't thunder all over New York at once. What can he do alone, against the pro-slavery spirit of New York. We have one lecturer in Pennsylvania, and not one in the West and the valley of the Mississippi. Now, sir, do we not want agents? Depend upon it, their voice reaches the South, if they cannot go there. One of the lecturers, not long ago, in New York, was taken aside by a stranger after he had done speaking: 'I am a slaveholder,' said the stranger from the South. 'I came in to hear what you had to say. I cannot express my gratitude. You are right—go on, God is with you!' The lecturer begged him to go to his room and talk the matter over. 'No sir,' said he, 'it won't do. I must not be known. I would gladly free my own slaves; but I want the

moral courage to do it. Public opinion is so strong, I cannot resist it. Go on. You are doing what many slaveholders desire; go on, till you make public opinion strong enough to sustain them in freeing their slaves. There are one hundred of my neighbors who feel as I do.' The lecturer asked him if he might learn his name. 'No,' he replied, 'that is not necessary.' Says he, 'they tell of shutting out your publications from the South. They can't do it. We get them by scores and read them, and they will be read, and will produce effect. Go on, sir, go on.'

This is the encouragement we have from slaveholders. We have thousands of friends among them, who pray in secret for our success. The other day, a note with *one hundred dollars* enclosed, was left in the Anti-Slavery Rooms at New York, saying, 'this is from a slaveholder.'

[Mr. Stanton made some farther eloquent appeals, adapted to the immediate occasion. He showed how little proportioned to the efforts required to produce the same sum in any other employment, was the mere support which the lecturers of the society desired to receive. They asked merely to be clothed, that they might appear decently, and to eat, that they might have strength to speak. He repelled with manly indignation the pretence of some, that he or others talked for the money they could get, when half the exertion would secure double remuneration in any other occupation.]

In the midst of his speaking, announcements were made (which gave a lively animation to the appeal) of pledges of *seven hundred dollars* from the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, subsequently increased to *one thousand dollars*. [This is the society, whose **TWENTY LADIES** were mobbed in Washington Street, Oct. 21, 1835, by the 'gentleman of property and standing.'] Three gentlemen in Boston, pledged *one hundred dollars* each. *Two hundred dollars* by a lady who did not give her name; *fifty dollars* by another lady, and *fifteen dollars* each by several ladies; *one hundred dollars* by a gentleman from East Hampton, *one hundred dollars* by another gentleman; Henry B. Chapman *one hundred dollars*; by a lady *one hundred dollars*; Fall River Society *three hundred dollars*; Salem Society *one thousand dollars*. [Mr. Grosvenor stated that this society was formed two years ago, by two men, who did not know of another person to join them.] In this form, and in quick succession, pledges and contributions continued to be received, until the adjournment for the day, when the sum of *six thousand one hundred and fifty four dollars* was found to be raised.

During the contribution several gentlemen spoke briefly.

ELIZUR WRIGHT, JR., of New York, mentioned an instance in proof, that the public sentiment at the North needed reform. He said, a lady from the North, recently went to New Orleans to settle an estate to which she was heir. One colored boy, a slave belonging to it, begged hard to be taken to the North and freed; but she said she could not afford it, so she sold him for a thousand dollars, and now she is in New York,

as much respected as if she had not sold a human being. She was a kind lady, but could not afford to lose a thousand dollars. The fault was not so much hers, as of public opinion at the North. Correct public opinion here, first, so that no man or woman will ever sell or buy a slave.

REV. MR. BOURNE, of New York, related the case of a young man at the South, who had read the Bible and abolition tracts, until he had become convinced, that a thief was a thief. His father died, and left his portion of the estate in slaves. The young man wanted to free them, but the laws and others concerned in the estate, prevented him, and rather than be an owner of men and women, he gave up his whole patrimony.

MR. STANTON—Said, there was a colored man now in this house, who had paid \$1,800, the earning of his own hands, to buy his own body, and purchase his wife out of slavery. His children had been sold he knew not where. This showed what the slave would do to get his freedom. [A great desire was expressed to see the colored man, and he came forward and stood on the platform, a stout healthy man of about fifty.]

He said his name was *Moses Grandy*. He lives on Copp's Hill, Boston. Was once a slave in North Carolina. My master said he gave me a chance to buy myself. I worked nights for it—tended corn and got out staves in the woods. Well, I gived him \$600 for to buy myself, and he turns round and sells me to another man. I was an orphan when he sold me. I paid him the money, little by little, when I earn it. Well, I turned round and told my new master, who didn't know I had bought myself, and he said I might again. So I went to work in canal boat, had a good chance, and bought myself again, but just then, my master got into difficulty: his estate was sold and I long with it. I got a good master that time, and he let me buy my liberty, and put the money I earn into nother man's hands. When I earn enough, he sent me to Providence, and make a freeman of me. He stated that his wife was afterwards redeemed for \$200. His children were sold and carried off, and can't tell where they are.

Some person near the platform said—why, they say a negro is incapable of taking care of himself. How could this man pay for himself three times?

Look dere, said Grandy, (holding out his two brawny arms and solid fists) dese arms could work for my masters all day, and earn enough in nights to buy myself three times.

Mr. Stanton said it was not uncommon for slaves to earn themselves by extra labor, and they were after sold again.

MR. TAYLOR, of Virginia, said he knew a case of a person in Norfolk, who had permitted a slave to buy himself, and when he had earned two thirds of the price, his master sold him. Give a negro the motive of liberty, and he would do the work of three slaves.

At six o'clock the Convention adjourned till to morrow morning at 9 o'clock.



## SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

Wednesday morning, 10 o'clock, Convention opened with Hymn by the Choir.

Prayer by David Root, of Dover, N. H.

REV. MR. CHOULES, of New Bedford, had recently returned from a visit to England. He was known there as an anti-slavery man, and had had full opportunity to study the feelings of philanthropists and Christians of that country, on the subject of American slavery. There is a deep feeling on the subject there, and it is unanimous and strong. If any man doubts it, let him go and see. If he be a minister, he will find it out before he gets into the pulpit. Are you an American? Are you a slaveholder? Are you in favor of slavery? These questions must be answered before he gets into a pulpit. It is not very easy to go into an English pulpit, without a confession of faith on slavery. It is just the reverse there of what it is here. The slavery ministers can no more get the command of a pulpit there, than the abolitionists could here, before I left this country for England. At my own home, just before I went to Europe, the discussion of slavery had been put down by a mob. I told them this in England. They were grieved and astonished. While in England, I had the privilege of conversing on this subject, with a man, who is one of the master spirits of the age, one who has given an immense impulse to mind in the great work of reform, and whose moral and intellectual influences have been felt in New England as well as Old England. I held a conversation of two hours with him on the subject. After I had told him what the mobs had done in the cities, said he, 'you must give up your cities. I had heard of your mobs there. There was never any great moral revolution affected in cities. All physical revolutions take place in cities, and all moral revolutions in the country. This is tested by the experience of all history. You must go back to the country, the cultivators of the soil, the small and quiet villages. There you will find moral independence. You can't find honesty and independence enough in the cities to carry forward a great moral reform. The men in cities can't afford to be honest. The influences of large communities are adverse to great moral movements.' This was the opinion of a man of profound observation, who had studied human nature philosophically. On one occasion, when I had related the failure of the anti-slavery meetings in Boston, for the want of a place to assemble in, a boy of fourteen asked me how large

Boston was. I told him. He wanted to know if we could not get a church there to meet in. No, I told him, not one, not even a vestry or a lecture room. He then asked why we did not get the 'Cradle,' for he had heard of Faneuil Hall, and wanted to know if that was worn out. I had to tell him that we could not get it for the same reason that Christ could not go in and out of the Temple; because the Rulers and Chief Priests stood at the door, ready to scourge us, and deliver us up to the people to be cast down over the brow of the hill.

There was one thing they could not comprehend in England; the aversion with which the whites regard the blacks in this country. They have their prejudices of rank and cast in England, but they can't understand, for their lives, why our prejudice is so great against color. I never saw a man in England I could make comprehend it. There is nothing of the kind there. It is almost as hard for them to believe the actual state of feeling in this country in regard to slavery, and the extent to which it is tolerated and approved by Christians, and men of the highest intellectual pretensions among us. If I were to go back to England and state there, in a public meeting, as a fact, what has actually happened in this city, within six months, viz: that a man, professing to be a minister of the gospel, and received in the churches as such, could buy a slave, sell him for \$1,000, put the money in his pocket, and come to Boston and get christian men and women to hear him preach—I doubt if I should be able to find a man in all England who would believe it. There is but one opinion in England on the subject of slavery. We have but little idea here, to what extent they feel and are prepared to act upon this subject. The moral and religious influences of that country, will be brought to bear with tremendous power upon this. All the philanthropy, all the literature, and all the Christianity of Europe will, before long, cry aloud for the abolition of American Slavery.

You will expect me to mention one, whom all love, *George Thompson*. I did not see Mr. Thompson in England. He was in Scotland and I in England, and we did not meet. I took much pains to inform myself of the state of public opinion in relation to Mr. Thompson; but I would state here publicly, that after all the inquiries I could make in England, I believe him to be as worthy a man as there is in this assembly. It was enough to learn the character of the men who had entire confidence in Mr. Thompson, to be satisfied of his worth and integrity. The friend of William Jay, Ralph Wardlaw, John Angel James, and Thomas Raffles, cannot be other than a good man.

Sir, I firmly believe that the time will come, when George Thompson will return to this country to witness the triumph of truth over error, principle over prejudice, and liberty over slavery. Again, I assure you, that all the sympathies of England are with you in this cause. Thousands of prayers ascend from their pulpits and places of worship, every Sabbath, for your success; that the yoke of the oppressor may be broken and the oppressed go free. God and good men are on your side.

REV. CHARLES STUART, offered the following :

*Resolved*, That when the Church becomes so corrupt as to use its influence to delay and prevent the fulfilment of the will of Christ respecting righteousness, peace, purity and temperance ; it becomes those who love and reverence the gospel, to associate themselves anew, for the support of these its fundamental principles ; and that such associations are the true and only Church of God.

Mr. Stuart supported the resolution. He defined an abolitionist to be one, who regards with impartial justice the equal rights of all men, and puts forth his best efforts to preserve them, or to return them where they have been taken away. In such a sense only did he delight, in every land, to be known by the name of abolitionist. How did this apply to the Church, in connection with its conduct, as a body, respecting slavery ? Churches were liable to corruption, as political parties or other associations were. This position Mr. Stuart illustrated by a brief review of the corruptions of the Church from original purity and simplicity, to the tyranny and profligacy of Popery: and then again, the corruptions of the Reformation. Bringing down the departures of the Church from correct principles of just and equal rights to the present time : he inquired what were the American churches, but the apologists of wrong and despotism : what were they but slaveholding churches, in deed and in precept ? If so, was it not necessary to purify the Church, and organize anew, as was done by the reformers, and again by the puritans ? There were two classes in the visible Church, the professing and the doing classes. One says, 'Father I go,' and goeth not. The other says, 'Father I go,' and goeth. The professing church excludes from the equal privileges of Christians, a particular class of our fellow-men :—the real Church imitates God, and is no respecter of persons. In the Celestial Empire, (China) they will spurn you as a fierce barbarian, for being a Christian, and a white man. That is their notion of particular classes. In this country the Church holds that it makes a difference in a man's rights, whether his skin is black or white, or his hair woolly or straight. The professing church advocates partial righteousness, the other universal righteousness. The former advocates peace in sin and with sin, the most atrocious sin. The other declares, that God has said, there is no peace to the wicked ; and hence, there can be no peace in sin, but a fearful looking for of judgment. The professing church advocates peace so far as selfishness, pride, and avarice will permit it to keep peace, and no farther. It advocates purity just so far as the impious do not start up and say, don't touch the delicate subject ! You may crush the sister that falls, but the brother, who is the most guilty, O ! he is a gentleman, and you must take him by the hand, and introduce him to your wives and daughters !

The professing church advocates temperance, so far as the grossest class of intoxicating drinks are concerned ; but when you come to wine, and fermented liquors, that too, is a delicate subject, and the church will only fall to pieces if you touch it. The other class, the church that does

as well as says, cannot so deceive themselves. They admit impartial and universal righteousness. They regard man as man, and all men as having souls to be saved. They do not ask whether a child of God has a white, yellow, brown or black skin, but whether he has been washed in the blood of the Lamb. They regard the negro as having the same hopes and fears, the same blessed promises of the gospel, the same responsibilities for eternity as the white man. The Christian Church advocates peace, and pursues it, whether all be quiet, or whether the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing, and pride, slander, wrath and violence are abroad in the land. It advocates the liberty of the gospel of peace, whether all men approve, or whether, as we have recently witnessed in the city of Boston, the men of 'property and standing,' assemble in mobs, to break up the religious meetings of a few women, and see fit to seize one of their fellow-citizens, put a rope about his body, and drag him through the streets, with the probability of sacrificing his life to the fury of the rioters. That is the time when the Christian can best show how he loves peace, but that he will, nevertheless, obey God rather than man. He will submit patiently to the fury of even his murderers, as Christ himself did, to put to shame the malice of men.

The Christian Church advocates purity in all men—in men as well as in women. In the master as well as the slave, in white as well as in black. It advocates temperance in all things—abstinence from all that brings intoxication; not an abstinence from a particular kind of drink, but from all intoxicating drinks, for the plain reason, that the danger and the evil lie in the *intoxication*—not in the particular article which is used. Herein the two classes in the Church differ materially, in these several respects, and many others that might be named. One class has a name to live, while they are dead. The other lives to God and for God, and the good of their fellow-men.

But what had this to do with abolition? The Church was an association for the extirpation of sin from the earth, not gradually, but immediately. Slavery was sin, and, therefore, the Church by tolerating or apologizing for slavery, became a partaker and encourager of sin. Slavery was a system fraught with all the sins and abominations which God has denounced in his holy law. Abolition was designed to extirpate this monstrous sin—a sin in which is embraced all the wrongs that man can do to man, and all that man can suffer from man. The object of abolition is to purge the Church, as well as the world, of this great iniquity, and to destroy sin by putting an end to one of the most fruitful sources of sin—slavery. The object of abolition is peace; that peace, which is peace—for peace in sin, is war with God.

Mr. Stuart went on to enforce these views of the duty of the Church in regard to slavery. The principles of abolition and of Christianity were the same; and though a man might be an abolitionist who was not a Christian, from the love of liberty and justice, yet it might well be

doubted, whether a man could be a Christian, and not be, in heart, an abolitionist ; for he could not see how a man could be a Christian, who, with the means of doing so, neglects to do all in his power to abolish the wrong and restore the right. If he be a Christian, he must believe slavery to be wrong, and therefore, he is called upon to do all in his power to abolish it. I would judge no man harshly, said Mr. Stuart, but I do not know what answer the slaveholding member of a church, who has sold and bought God's image, in the person of a slave, who may have been washed white in the blood of the Lamb—I say, I do not know what answer such a professing Christian can make in the day of judgment, when Christ, pointing to the redeemed slaves, shall say, 'inasmuch as ye did it not unto these, ye did it not unto me—depart ye cursed.' I use the language of Christ, and not my own.

REV. O. S. MURRAY, of Vermont, seconded the resolution. He said, that the question might be asked, were there no Christians who were slaveholders? He would not undertake to decide how far a man could go in doing injustice to his neighbor, and yet be a Christian. He would not decide how far he could trample on God's laws, and still be a Christian. Others must determine that point. He once heard a clergyman in Vermont, addressing a Colonization Society say, that some of the best men, and the best Christians he ever knew, were slaveholders. 'Lead us not into temptation,' was the prayer of the Christian. He would not say how good a man could be who sought temptation,—while the slaveholder held in his hands the power to sever all ties, to tear asunder the husband and wife, the parent and child, he would not undertake to say how far he could exercise that power,—how far he could take labor without wages, how far he may send the wife from the husband—whether twenty or an hundred miles—how often he may inflict stripes, and to what extent he may act the hard task-master, and still be a christian. Nor would he pretend to define, to what extent the slaveholder may withhold the word of God from those in his power, and be a christian.

But there were kind and Christian masters? Did they obey the law of love? did they do unto these slaves as they would their slaves should do unto them? They upheld the cruel system of slavery, and no thanks to the system, if a particle of light ever reached the benighted mind of the slave. No thanks to the system, if every slave does not suffer all the wrongs ever inflicted on any one slave; for the master has the power and may use it, and the cruelty inflicted on any slave grows out of the system. That system puts the unrestrained power into the hands of a man to trample on the image of God, and level it to the condition of brutes and reptiles. No thanks to the system, if the master feeds and clothes the slave. He does it that the slave may be profitable to the master. The ox and the horse are treated with care and kindness for the same reason. The best condition of the slave is a constant liability to the worst treatment. If he have the best master to day, to-morrow he may be sold to the worst.

But we must be charitable. We are all *sinner*s. True, but do not Christians profess to repent of sin? The slavholder is thus driven to stand up and say that slavery is no sin. How can we get along with those who stand up and justify sin, and say they are not sinners? But they are good and influential, and wealthy men, and we must not separate from them! Well, where do this influence, and wealth, and goodness go? Do they not uphold the sin of slavery? How do you reason on the question of temperance? Who is the most in the wrong there, the greatest obstacle to the cause? The drunkard who lies in the street, and cannot turn to prevent the sun scorching his face? Or is it the good and influential man, who will call for his glass of gin or brandy, and go into the pulpit and ask the blessing of God? The drunkard is an object of disgust. The good and influential man is an example. So is it with the slaveholder. It is the good and influential man, the professing Christian, whose example holds up the system of slavery, and quiets the conscience of the slaveholder. What had good men done who were slaveholders? Five or six years ago, one of the good men, a Methodist minister in Virginia, of the name of Hall, promised a slave his liberty, and when he had earned it, he sold him. He was a good man. A Baptist association in Georgia, of good men, undertook to settle a question in relation to second marriages of slaves. It was whether, when husband and wife were separated at an inconvenient distance, they might marry again? This question was to be settled with the Bible open before these good men and Christians, wherein is written the law of God, 'thou shalt not commit adultery,' and the injunction of the Apostle, 'let every man have his own wife, and every wife her own husband.' The case might be supposed where the minister of a church has sold the wife to the deacon, retaining the husband, and the deacon and minister live at an inconvenient distance from each other. Can they marry again? What do you think was the answer of these pious men. In the face of the law of God, they said, that they might marry again!

[REV. E. M. P. WELLS—Yes, and the reason they gave for it—for they had a reason—was, that the slaves were not free agents!]

MR. MURRAY. A good reason truly, for good men. This shows the influence of slavery on good men, against the Bible. Another good man, Rev. Stephen Olin, a Methodist minister, son of judge Olin, who has been Lieutenant Governor of Vermont, went to Georgia and married a slave property. Some he sold, but contrived to hold others as slaves. The influences of such good men and their friends and relatives of the North, is favorable to slavery.

But it is said we must not break from them. We must keep with them to reform them. Is this the way we reform other sinners? Do we go into the tavern and treat the drunkard, in order to reform him? Do we excuse his conduct that we may convince him it is sinful? How long

can we continue to walk with those who disregard the plainest precepts of Christianity, and yet not be partakers in their sin? How can we get at the conscience of the slaveholder if we apologize for the sin of slavery, and regard it as in no way taking from him the claims to christian fellowship?

[The reader will more distinctly understand the allusions in Mr. Murray's speech, to the act of a Southern Baptist association, by perusing the annexed account of that transaction, which was read in the Convention:

*'Second Marriages of Slaves.*—The following is from the proceedings of the Savannah River Baptist Association, as published in the Southern Baptist of Dec. 18.

“The first Query is, whether, in case of involuntary separation, of such a character as to preclude all prospects of future intercourse, the parties ought to be allowed to marry again?”

To this your committee recommend the following answer—that such separation among persons situated as our slaves are, is civilly a separation by death, and they believe that in the sight of God it would be so viewed. To forbid second marriages in such case would be to expose the parties, not only to strange hardships and strong temptations, but to church censure, for acting in obedience to their masters, who cannot be expected to acquiesce in a regulation at variance with justice to the slaves and to the spirit of that command which regulates marriage among Christians. The slaves are not free agents, and a dissolution by death is not more entirely without their consent, and beyond their control, than by such separation.”

MR. ELIZUR WRIGHT, JR., of New York, said he had objections to the resolution, which would take him half an hour to state. He would not go into them, but would simply remark, that the object of abolitionism was not sectarianism—that its design was to purify, and not to sever the Church. He could not approve of that part of the resolution which advised a separation, for the purpose of forming a new church, around which, the circle of infallibility was to be drawn, with the inscription, this is the only true Church. He did not believe that Christ ever recommended any such Church.

REV. MR. PECKHAM, of Haverhill, Mass. said, we claimed the right of free discussion, and he called in question some of the statements that had been made on this resolution. He objected to the resolution because this Convention was not an ecclesiastical body, and not the place to arraign the old churches, or establish new ones. Many of the members of this Convention were not members of churches, and therefore, not proper persons to sit in judgment on the conduct of church members as such. There were ministers here from all parts of New England. What was to be the effect of this resolution? Shall we go home and undertake to separate the sheep from the goats. Shall we say of this man, who is an abolitionist, stand thou here, and to another, who is opposed to a bolition, stand thou there? How are we qualified to perform this high church censorship? Are there no spots upon our garments, which those we undertake to sever from the Church, may point out? No, sir. Let us not be exclusive—let us take broad ground, relying, not upon church discipline, but upon the force of the great principles of philanthropy, liberty, and Christianity. Let us suffer wrong rather than do wrong.

The apostles suffered and counted it glory. We rarely find them alluding to their persecutions, or striving to excite feelings against their persecutors. If we are suffering persecution in a good cause, we shall rarely think of it or speak of it. He regretted that allusion was so often made to the persecutions of abolitionists, and particularly to the scene that occurred in Washington Street. Instead of railing at those who then put a stop to our meetings, let us rejoice at the change that has taken place in public opinion, and that we can now meet together unmolested, in this large and commodious church.

[I call the gentleman to order.—Hear him.—Hear him! *The President*—Go on, sir, it is the wish of the Convention to hear you.]

I say, sir, that we ought to feel grateful that our cause is gaining ground, and instead of being crowded into a small place, we are now permitted to meet here. I believe the cause will progress. On the question of abolition, I am ready to go as far as any anti-slavery man I ever saw, but when a measure is proposed that must divide the churches, I shall oppose it. [Applause.]

REV. GEORGE ALLEN, of Shrewsbury—Was desirous that the Convention should act with harmony. He accorded with the sentiments expressed in the resolution, but he found more was meant than at first appeared. The sentiment might be correct in the main, but the result should be looked at. The vituperation, denunciation, and division of the churches, which are to follow, constituted the danger of the resolution. He hoped that no resolution would be passed here, that could not pass with unanimity. The moral force of their proceedings mainly depended on the unanimity with which they were adopted.

REV. MR. WRIGHT, of Boston, moved a recommitment of the resolution to the same committee, and after some conversation, it was so referred. The committee subsequently reported a substitute in the following form :

*Resolved*, That the countenance given to slavery by the participation and apologies of the principal branches of the christian Church, has been more effectual for its support than any other cause, nor can we look for its abolition till the Church is purified from this sin.

The resolution in this form, was briefly supported by Mr. Oakes, of Ipswich, Milligan, of Vermont, and E. Wright, of New York, and passed unanimously.

REV. MR. ROOT, of Dover, N. Hampshire, offered the following, which he supported :

*Resolved*, That, inasmuch as the principles and measures of abolitionists are based upon the word of God, it is the duty of the ministers of the gospel, and Christians generally, to come to the aid of this great enterprise of delivering the captives of this land.

Mr. Root said, this was a duty, on the ground that the principles and measures of the abolitionists were based on the word of God, and if they were



so based, it was the duty of all good men to come to our aid. The fundamental principle of abolition was, that slavery is sin. This was shown by a description of the fruits of slavery. Hence, if by their fruits ye should know them, then slavery was sin; and if sin, it ought, at once, to be abandoned. Slavery was a violation of every rule of the Decalogue—and not only so, it was a violation of the rights of man, and the principles of equality laid down in the Constitution. Who, with the heart of a man, could doubt this? None. None but a Nero, or a M'Duffie would question such principles as these. Some contended that the Bible justified slavery. The Bible? If, said Mr. Root, I believed that the Bible countenanced and approved such a system as this sin of slavery, that would be sufficient reason for me to reject the Bible. I would never believe that it was the word of God to justify such abuses. The principles of opposition to slavery were so plain, it was like laboring to show the sun shines, to attempt to prove them. If you deny my ownership of myself, how shall I prove the opposite? If I have not a right to myself, who has? If the declaration of equality of natural rights, in the Declaration of Independence, is a mere *rhetorical flourish*, then our fathers were not wise men, to go to war upon a rhetorical flourish. If slavery is not a sin against God, when it involves a violation of every law of God, then are the commands of God naught, and truth is fable. I say, therefore, abolition is based on the gospel, and therefore, all Christians are bound to come to its aid.

But, perhaps it is said, we like your principles, but we cannot co-operate with your measures. Now our measures are the practical operation of our principles. Faith without works is dead. If we believe slavery a sin, we must labor to remove it. Our measures are peaceful, not beligerant. We reject all carnal weapons, and use only those that are mighty to the pulling down of the strong holds of sin. The whole design is to use a moral influence in order to effect a change in public sentiment, that will lead to the demolition of this system. We hope to reach the hearts of Christians, and convince them that God is angry with this nation every day for the sin of slavery. We hope to persuade ministers and Christians to give their labors and talents to the enterprise; to satisfy them that they have no right to pass by this great subject, and like the Priest and Levite, leave the slave to perish. Why object to these measures? They were the same that had been used by reformers in all ages. Would you have us use force? You could not persuade us to use such means. What are our measures more than those God has instituted from the beginning—to cry aloud and show unto the people their sins!

Perhaps it would be said, that our language was harsh, and we called hard names. We may have erred in this respect, but let it be remembered that the friends of this cause have suffered much, and have found no protection in the laws of the land. They have submitted to violence, and seen the men in high places winking at it, and even their brethren

deserting and betraying them. May not all these complaints of our harshness be attributed to a want of a just sense of the enormity of slavery, and the misrepresentations of those who complain of us? If they had just views of slavery, our language and epithets against it might not seem so severe. Was the language of abolitionists against slaveholders any severer than the language of the temperance reformers against distillers and venders of ardent spirits? What was once thought unpardonable in language, as applied to that case, is now admitted to be just, and when more light was shed, the same would be thought of the language, now called harsh, toward slaveholders and slavery. We disclaim every thing unkind—that savors of retaliation, or malice, or revenge, but we must be honest, we must speak the truth. It is our privilege to speak the truth and lie not. We compare slavery with the Bible, which says, ‘thou shalt not steal,’ and finding that the origin of slavery is theft, we call it by its right name, man-stealing. We find by the same rule, that those who excuse sin are partakers of sin, and we say so. We use the truth, because we believe that truth alone can be effectual to the overthrow of this system of error and wrong; and here we appeal to every Christian to come to the aid of this great work of delivering their fellow-men.

REV. MR. HARRIS, of Haverhill, Mass., seconded the foregoing resolution in a speech in the afternoon, which we expected to receive from him, in season to insert in this connection, but have been disappointed.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention was opened by singing a Hymn.

The Committee of Finance reported, that after ascertaining the amount of expenses attending the Convention, it recommends, that each member of the Convention pay into the Treasury fifty cents.

The report was accepted.

[Some time was spent in calling for further subscriptions in aid of the cause. Most of the societies doubled the amount they had pledged to pay the day before, and a great many individuals contributed considerable sums. A friend to the slave *thirty-seven dollars*, several ladies *fifteen dollars* each. The Uxbridge Juvenile Society *twenty dollars*. Twenty ladies *five dollars* each. J. S Kimball *one hundred dollars*, Ebenezer Dole *one hundred dollars*. *Fifteen hundred and thirty dollars* were collected this afternoon, which added to the subscriptions of the preceding day, amounted to the sum of *seven thousand six hundred and eighty-four dollars*. During the subscription, several pithy and animated appeals were made. We preserve a brief sketch.]

MR. E. WRIGHT, of New York. If Mr. Jefferson, fifty years ago, saw

cause to say, 'I tremble for my country, when I consider that God is just'—what would he say if he saw slavery as it exists now? Is it not the opinion of the wisest men in the land, that this institution cannot stand much longer?—it must be abolished, and if we calculate to have the opportunity to do it peaceably, we must do it now.

MR. STANTON. Our cause is suffering for lack of Agents. Your Agents only ask the means to live; but they cannot beg nor earn their bread, while they are pleading for the slave. No Agent can go to make a speech with a contribution box in his hand. Why, they mob us for presuming to come to speak at all, and what would they do if we asked them to pay for our speeches? Besides, we want others than speakers. There are some whose talents don't run off their tongues, but out of their fingers—we want Editors.

REV. MR. GROSVENOR. We are bound to concentrate our charities on this cause. Other men will take care of other causes who will give nothing for this.

MR. STANTON. Gerrit Smith has given *seven thousand dollars* to this cause since he has been connected with it.

MR. GROSVENOR. Support the weak is the gospel maxim. Prop up the strong is the world's maxim.

MR. WINSLOW. Where is our sister Maine? Why don't we hear from her?

MR. BURLEIGH. The reason we don't hear from her is, that a member of Congress says, abolition is dead there. Let us raise something for the epitaph. [Here sums amounting to *three hundred and twenty dollars* were annexed from Maine.]

MR. BURLEIGH. I forgot. The monument should come before the epitaph. This will do to begin it.

MR. E. WRIGHT, of New York. 134 abolition societies were formed last year in Ohio. They met at Granville to hold a covention. Every church was shut, and they held their covention in a *barn*. They had resolved to raise *five thousand dollars* during the year, but they collected *four thousand dollars* in the barn, and resolved to raise *six thousand dollars* more. We may depend upon *ten thousand dollars* from Ohio. Every abolitionist can revolutionise one town in a year, if he will set about it.

MR. STANTON. Do Christians ever hope for the millenium? Can it come while slavery is here? Why, where are we in 1836? Slavery ought to have been prostrated, buried, and its epitaph written long ago, and we going forward achieving other victories for the glory of God. How long shall the darkness of slavery, and the thick darkness of pre-

judice continue to overshadow the nation? Let us roll away this cloud in the name of God! [Amen! from a voice in the gallery.]

MR. E. WRIGHT, of New York. Mr. Weld, the Agent in New York, appointed a meeting in Lockport. The pro-slavery men came there, took possession, and resolutionised Mr. Weld out. He went on talking, and they went on resolving, until they became interested; many remained, and a society of abolitionists was formed on the spot, with 446 members. There was no mobbing. But in the christian town of Granville, they mobbed J. G. Birney for freeing his own slaves!

MR. TAYLOR, of Virginia. If you could look on a Virginia plantation, and see what I have seen, you would empty your pockets. A Methodist minister wrote this book I hold in my hand. He lived in a slave state, and had resolved never to sleep on a feather bed, while the slave slept on a board, and never to wear any better cloth than the negro cloth that clothes the slave. The professors of religion used to keep their slaves at home from meeting on Sunday, to cook hot dinners. Some of the brethren resolved to eat no Sunday dinners cooked by the slaves, and it had a powerful effect. [The collections here closed, and the Convention resumed the main business.]

MR. WRIGHT, of Boston, offered the following:

*Resolved*, That regarding a surrender of our *right of free discussion* upon the altar of southern slavery, as involving, on our part, the commission of moral suicide—treachery to the cause of civil liberty and of humanity—and guilt before High Heaven; we hereby pledge ourselves to one another—to the oppressor and the oppressed—to our country and our God—that, undeterred by threats of ‘persecution at common law,’ whether in the messages of our governors, the pages of our theological reviews, or the reports of legislative committees, come what may—gag law or lynch law—we will never cease from its exercise, full, free, and undiminished, until the last fetter shall be broken, and slavery and prejudice shall be buried in one common grave.

Sir, said Mr. Wright, this resolution is strong in language. It is designed to be so. It is designed to be the solemn and calm assertion of a right which we never will surrender but with our lives. We have been called upon from the highest official source in this state to surrender the right of free discussion. We mean to be understood that we regard that call as an appeal to us to commit moral suicide. Shall we be so treacherous to humanity, as to give up the right of pleading for humanity? Sir, that man is recreant to himself, to his country, and to his God, who will listen to such a demand from any man, be he governor, judge, minister, or member of the Legislature. Here we stand ready to pledge ourselves never to give up this right, and to justify ourselves in maintaining, that right on every principle upon which are bound the institutions of our country, and the religion we profess. Before God and man, we pledge ourselves to one another, never to cease from the exercise of this right. We pledge ourselves to the oppressor. Let them hear it at the South, and let them know, that in no spirit of threatening, but in the spirit of the gospel, which teaches us to love our enemies, and to do good

to them that persecute us and revile us, we will never abandon the right of free discussion. We pledge ourselves to the oppressed, to the down-trodden slave. Our voice cannot reach them, but I would they could hear this. It would teach them to wait patiently for the time of their deliverance—to bear oppression and wrong without resistance, with meekness and submission. Sir, I present this resolution to the solemn deliberation of this Convention, for such an expression as shall give to it the most emphatic sanction.

REV. MR. THURSTON, of Maine, moved, that when the vote is taken, it be taken by rising. Agreed to unanimously.

GEN. JAMES APPLETON, of Maine, called the attention of the Convention to the comparison which was now so frequently made between the relative condition of the laboring slaves of the South, and the working freemen of the North. This was a strong and striking proof of the injustice and dangerous tendency of slavery. This comparison cannot be made without diminishing the love of liberty. Mr. Calhoun, one of the most eloquent and accomplished men in our country, has recently said, in the Senate of the United States, that labor produces property, but that the producer has little to do with the disposition of property, and it therefore matters little whether property is produced by slave labor or free labor. It matters little, he contends, whether the laborer is under the protection of law, or under the kind influences of a master. This is the doctrine to which we are called on to surrender the right of free discussion, on the ground that it matters little, to the maintenance of our free institutions, whether the Northern workman is a freeman or a slave. What is civil liberty? I should say it is free discussion. Without this, every man is a slave. The mind is enchained, which is the worst kind of slavery.

Sir, what has called for this resolution at this time? Do we not live in a land where freedom of discussion is secured by the Constitution and laws? Has any thing transpired that renders it pertinent for us to re-assert so well established a right? There has. There has been and now is, a conspiracy, of the community at large, against the right of free discussion. Notwithstanding the Constitution of the United States, and of every State in the Union, provides for freedom of discussion, yet the foremost men, the great men, the learned men, the rich men, and professing christian men, are united to put down free discussion. They tell us that the only way to save the Union is to destroy the Constitution. They charge us with violating a compact of the Constitution, by talking about slavery, and they themselves trample on the Constitution, and lay violent hands on every other part of it, in order, as they say, to preserve that part which secures slavery. Yes, sir. The compact that secures slavery must not even be discussed, while all the compacts that protect liberty are to be set at naught. What was the design of those, who, to pre-

serve the slavery compact, at the expense of the liberty compacts, held the pro-slavery meeting in Faneuil Hall. It was to limit free discussion. What is the recommendation, in an address of the Governor of Massachusetts, and the governors of most of the free States? Is it an appeal to the people to promote the love of liberty, and the purity and simplicity of republican institutions? Not at all. Their whole efforts have been to preserve slavery; to stop free discussion; to bring down the freemen of the North to the degraded level of the bondmen of the South! Sir, it has been the boast of the age, that in this country, man has made great progress in civil liberty. Could this have been done without free discussion? Are we not going backward? We wonder that our fathers, who were driven here by persecution, should themselves have persecuted for opinions' sake. They persecuted the Quakers and Baptists, as their descendants now do the abolitionists. Was it because they were bad men? No; but because they did not understand, in that respect, the principles of religious liberty. Do not those who persecute us show their ignorance of the principles of civil liberty? Not one of them dares deny the right of free discussion in *principle*—'t is only in *practice* he opposes it, and that too, under pretence of great devotion for liberty. 'Do you mean to deny me the freedom of speech?' asks the abolitionist, of the pro-slavery men. 'Oh, no! But'—'But what? Have I not a right to speak and publish what I please, if I violate no law of the land?' 'Yes, but!'—'But what?' 'Why the Union is in the way.' 'The Union in the way? Does not the Constitution that creates this Union, secure to me, unimpaired, the free exercise of the freedom of speech?' 'True, but'—'But, again? if there is a *but* in the way, there is no liberty. There has been a *but* in the way of freedom all the world over. It is this *but* which prevents every despot in Europe from being thrown down from his seat of power. It is this *but* which denies their rights to the oppressed and the enslaved every where. This *but* would put down every new doctrine ever advanced. Admit the *but*, and there is an end to civil freedom. It is the purpose of this resolution, calmly, but firmly, to protest against this *but*.

REV. GUY C. SAMPSON, of N. Goshen, Conn. Sir, what are we called upon to surrender? We cannot surrender the right of free discussion—for it is a right given us by God, an *inalienable* right, affirmed in the Declaration of Independence! God demands of us the exercise of all our moral faculties, and we cannot surrender this right. We do not ask of human laws to *give* us the right of free discussion. We only ask of those laws to stand apart, and not interfere with the right God has given us. In the abandonment of this right is involved the surrender of liberty, not merely civil, but religious liberty. The surrender of the right of discussion, is the surrender of the fundamental principles of Protestantism. Take away free discussion, and you re-establish the infallibility of the Pope and the power of the Inquisition. What fell on the nations

like the explosion of a bomb-shell, when the voice of a single man was raised against the hierarchies of Europe? Martin Luther's free discussion. Had that been stopped, the Reformation would have been stopped. This is the fundamental principle our fathers contended for, and this is the fundamental principle of Protestantism. If it be now surrendered, we invite despotism; we call back the Pope, we invoke the spirit of the inquisition—the blackness and darkness of hell.

MR. H. B. STANTON. Sir, it would be well for those, who appeal to us to stop free discussion, to reflect who it is they compliment by it. Do those who attempt to put down free discussion on slavery, compliment themselves or the people? No, sir, they confess their own weakness, they libel the good sense of the people, and compliment those, whose arguments they dare not trust the people to hear. ¶They say to the people, of every abolition lecturer, 'it won't do for *you* to hear that fellow talk.' 'Why?' 'You hav'nt *sense enough* to separate the sophistry from the truth. You can't be trusted to listen for yourselves. He will tack you to his coat, and drag you wherever he pleases, and therefore, *we* must take care of you, and tell you what it will do for you to hear, and what not.' This is the practical language of these guardians of the people, who are so much alarmed at the force of truth brought out by free discussion.

When all other arguments and appeals to put down free discussion fail, we are then told of the Constitution. O, yes, many people have such conscientious scruples about the Constitution, that although the fundamental principle of the Constitution is free discussion, they tell us we must not use free discussion, because it will violate the Constitution! Sir, we all love the Constitution, but let us not make the instrument that secures our liberties, an engine to destroy them. Let us beware of setting up the Constitution or the Union, as a sort of Juggernaut, which is to be used to crush the people. Let us not bow down in idolatry to the Constitution, and deny ourselves the right even to argue that it ought not to be changed, right or wrong. 'But why discuss slavery?' If you ask me this, I ask you why you discuss any thing I don't approve? Who is to be the censor to decide just what subjects shall and what shall not be discussed? The Constitution gives us the right to discuss. God commands us to break the yoke of the oppressor, and let the oppressed go free; and if man forbids, while God commands, it is better to obey God than man.

There is one broad answer to all this—the Constitution secures free discussion. That is enough—and that is my answer to the mob, who would violate the Constitution, in order, as they pretend, to save the Union. Sir, I will speak of mobs, although my brother (Rev. Mr. Peckham) says, forbear. I wish to see mobs held up to the indignation of the people every where. I have no apologies to make for mobs. 'But won't you forgive them if they repent?' Yes, but they don't repent—they claim the right to shut our mouths against speaking for freedom, and pre-

tend they do it in the name of freedom and the Constitution! The *ladies*, who were mobbed in Washington Street, had the shield of the Constitution over them. So had the Editor of the *Liberator*, when he was dragged through the streets of Boston, with a rope about him, for standing under that broad shield, and proclaiming liberty to the captives. Are these things to be lightly passed, over and easily forgotten? Then, sir, will it be easy to forget that we are freemen.

*Free Discussion!*—Who fears it? Jefferson said that error of opinion might be safely tolerated, where reason was left free to combat it. But those who insist most that we are in error, have no reason but *force* to combat us with. Now, sir, we may talk about any thing, the most radical reform and changes in our Government and Constitution: but, here is a subject, they tell us—this slavery—so important, so high, it must not be touched at all. Yes, sir. Here is a disease preying upon the vitals of society, a cancer in the body politic, but you must not touch it! And this is the doctrine, and these are the times of 1836!

Our opponents, who are so tenacious against our interference with them, are very ready to interfere with us. They say we have no right to interfere with slavery in the slave States. That is very true. We have no right to interfere by armies, or with any kind of force. But have we no right to speak what we believe is the truth? Have we no right to convince men? What is interference? If we pray for the abolition of slavery, is that interference? and will our opponents put down *prayer* by mob law, by lynch law, by the Constitution, by the Governor, or by the Legislature? What is prayer? It is the thought that springs from the soul, and climbs the ladder of Jacob to heaven. Can the mob or the Legislature put that down? But we have no right to interfere. We may discuss and condemn every thing else in the Constitution, but we must not say a word against slavery, because we have no right to *interfere!* And thus our opponents have coined a phrase by which they are leading captive, not only silly women, but silly men. Sir, let us stand on this rock of free discussion, and fear not the beatings of the tempest. Let us never provoke mobs, unless truth will provoke them, but let us not be over-anxious when there is an indication of a mob to put down free discussion. It may be that blood will be shed, as a sacrifice, on the altar of free discussion. Be it so. There are times, when to assert a great principle, men should stand up fearlessly and be a willing sacrifice on God's altar; on the altar of human rights. This may be one of those occasions. The doctrine of caution and forbearing to speak against sin, was not the doctrine on which Christ and his apostles promulgated Christianity. No, sir. Free discussion is the pillar of fire that goes before us. It is the morning star, the light of Heaven, that is to shed its glory abroad, and scatter the darkness of worlds.

REV. MR. FITCH, of Boston. Mr. President—A brother has proposed that we rise to pledge ourselves to this resolution. I should be ashamed



ed, sir, to remain on my seat when such a pledge as this shall be given ; but, before I rise to give my assent to the resolution, I wish to make a single remark in relation to the last clause of it. The resolution, sir, proposes that prejudice and slavery be put to death, and buried in a common grave. I am opposed to this, for two reasons.

1. I regard it as altogether too easy a death.

2. I know not but some wretch may be found, in some corner of our land, to dig up the putrid carcasses, and lay them up in the sun, to throw abroad their stench, and scatter disease, and desolation, and death throughout the land. What, sir, is the cry which comes echoing across our land? What kind of a death do they inflict upon the colored man, when, goaded on to desperation by his wrongs, he spills the blood of man in self-defence? Do they kill him and bury him? No, sir. Of this we would not so much complain. *They put him into the fire and burn him!*

Sir, I would have prejudice and slavery suffer the same death. Let us have them consumed, that not a vestige of them remain to curse the earth.

And now, sir, as I am making my maiden speech on the subject of abolition, let me just deliver myself of the whole amount of my incendiarism at once. I am not afraid of fire, provided we have something that ought to be burned, and the right fire with which to kindle it. Sir, I would have prejudice and slavery burned. Look at the prejudice which exists against the colored man at the North, and behold its magnitude! You might throw all the mountains of New Hampshire and Vermont into a single pile, and here is a mountain that would o'ertop them all. Sir, I would have it burned. Look now at slavery as it exists in the South, with its wickedness, its hard-hearted selfishness, its amazing cruelty; and here you have another mountain. Why, sir, you might roll all the Alleghanies into a single cone, and take your post on the topmost peak of its apex, and this mountain would tower far above, out of your sight. I would have it burned.

I would have the friends of humanity and of God, go through the land, with the blazing torch of truth in one hand, and the lamp of love in the other, and kindle these tremendous piles. Let the flame thereof go up to heaven, overtop every mountain, and throw its light across every valley, until the whole earth shall be lighted up—yea, engulfed in the flood of its glory.

Sir, I would not injure a hair of any man's head—but I would be willing that every slaveholder at the South, and every other man who will harbor these vile prejudices in his breast, should be thrown into such a fire as this, until he should be thoroughly singed from head to heels, and not a bristle of his abominable wickedness left standing.

I am for the resolution, sir, with all my heart. I would have prejudice and slavery put to death: but let us do the the work effectually, so that even their ghost shall never come up to haunt us.

REV. THEODORE S. WRIGHT, of New York. Sir, if the two millions and a half of my brethren could hear this resolution, they would be rejoiced—they would feel convinced that their cause was not to be given up. Doubtless, sir, it would be so. There would be a shout—as in the West Indies, that memorable day of emancipation in 1834—‘Free discussion shall never be given up.’ This would be the shout of the slave here; and he would cry, ‘Glory to God in the highest—the mouths of those who speak for us, who cannot speak for ourselves, shall never be shut!’ But, sir, my apprehension was, that the last part of the resolution was to be overlooked, and that some thought that prejudice was to be left off. That we must first kill slavery, and leave prejudice to take care of itself. Why, sir, prejudice is slavery. No man can really understand this prejudice, unless he feels it crushing him to the dust, because it is a matter of feeling. It has bolts, scourges, and bars, wherever the colored man goes. It has bolts in all the schools and colleges. The colored parent, with the same soul as a white parent, sends his child to the seats of learning, and he finds the door bolted, and he sits down to weep beside his boy. Prejudice stands at the door and bars him out. Does the child of the colored man show a talent for mechanics? The heart of the parent beats with hope. He sees the children of the white man engaged in employment, and he trusts that here is a door open to his boy, to get an honest living and become a useful member of society. But, when he comes to the work-shop with his child, he finds a bolt there. But, even suppose he can get this first bolt removed, he finds other bars. He can’t work. Let him be ever so skilled as a mechanic, up starts prejudice, and says ‘I won’t work in the shop if you do.’ Here he is scourged by prejudice, and has to go back, and sink down to some of the employments which white men leave for the most degraded. He hears of the death of a child, from home, and he goes in a stage or a steamboat. His money is received, but he is scourged there by prejudice. If he is sick, he can have no bed, he is driven on deck; money will not buy for him the comforts it gets for all who have not his complexion. He turns to some friend among the white men; perhaps that white man had sat at his table at home, but he does not resist prejudice here. He says, ‘Submit. ’Tis an ordinance of God—you must be humble.’ Sir, I have felt this. As a minister, I have been called to pass often up and down the North River, in steamboats. Many a night have I walked the deck, and not been allowed to lie down in a bed. Prejudice would even turn money to dross, when it was offered for these comforts by a colored man. Thus, prejudice scourges us from the table, it scourges us from the cabin, from the stage-coach, from the bed, wherever we go, it has for us bolts, bars, and rods.

But it is asked, ‘What do you colored people want us to do?’ We do not ask you to break down any of the rules of society. Treat us just according to our moral worth and nothing more. We want you to treat us as honest people. Give us a motive for emulation, industry, and improvement. Leave us the same chance to find our level in society that

other men have. You have no trouble among yourselves. You treat men according to their worth. If you find a virtuous man or woman, you treat them as such—just according to their moral and intellectual worth. All we ask is, let us educate our sons, if we can. If we have bright children, let us put them to trades. Try us, fairly, and see if the colored race cannot improve and elevate themselves in the scale of *moral being*. How can we contend against these prejudices? The colored man is even excluded from the house of God. Even at the Communion Table, he can only partake the crumbs offered to him after others have been served. This prejudice drives the colored man away from religion. I have often heard my brethren say, they would have nothing to do with such a religion. They are driven away, and go to infidelity. But, blessed be God, it is doing better. A better spirit is prevailing. Abolish prejudice, and you will abolish slavery with it. The colored man begins to be regarded as if he was a man. It is in this way religion is gaining with the colored people. They will respect religion if they find it alone can break down and remove this unholy prejudice; and thus it will be, my friends, that religion and abolition will walk together hand in hand.

MR. LOSS, of the Oneida Institute, N. York, said—That being connected with an institution, whose object it was to break down this prejudice, by opening the doors of learning to the colored as well as to the white man's son, he had seen much of the effects of this prejudice. But much might be done to remove it, if the friends of abolition would always do their duty. He did not like to speak of himself, but a short time ago he had occasion to test this. He was travelling from N. York to Albany with an intelligent, likely colored boy of fourteen, well dressed, who was going to enter the Oneida College. At the breakfast hour, he took him to the public table and sat beside him. Perhaps fifty persons were at the table. He saw the storm gathering, and the lightning ready to flash, and expected it to burst, but it did not. We were permitted to eat our breakfast in peace. Had the boy been driven from the table, I should have gone with him. This was one of the best means to convince men of the injustice of this prejudice.

REV. S. J. MAY, said—That no man, who valued any of the privileges of a free government, can too highly appreciate the importance of the first part of this resolution. Few seem to be aware of the danger impending over our free institutions. Has it come to this, that we are not to be allowed to speak what we think, and yet, shall it be pretended that we live in a land of freedom? The disclaimer of the right of free discussion, is the abandonment of it, the disuse of it, is the loss of it. I appeal to those who laid the foundations of our country's freedom, if they ever thought it *patriotism* to give up the right of speaking what they thought of the abuses of government, and the wrongs of the people!

Did they not regard free discussion as the main bulwark of liberty? Did they not insist on it, as a first and fundamental principle in the Constitution, that there should be no interference with the liberty of speech, and the press, and with the right of the people peaceably to assemble to consult on the public good, and petition their rulers for a redress of wrongs? If we, their descendants, now surrender this great right, shall we not be false to the principles of civil liberty? But I will not enlarge on this topic. My particular object in rising is, to call the attention of this Convention, and of the people, to the danger to which that liberty, for which our fathers contended, is exposed, by the doctrines of men, high in power. I hold in my hand the inaugural address of His Excellency, Edward Everett, Governor of this Commonwealth, and I ask you to listen to the language, which is uttered in Massachusetts, by its own Executive. He tells us, that that which abolitionists are doing, that which we are now assembled to do, 'Is an offence that may be prosecuted as a misdemeanor, at common law.' Well, then, why have they not done it? Why have they not brought us before a jury, as criminals, to be tried for this new crime of free discussion? They dare not meet us there—they dare not attempt so gross an outrage on the Constitution, until they have more thoroughly perverted the public sentiment on this subject. And I am more offended at this speech of His Excellency, for its insinuation, that we are violators of the laws, than if he had himself directed a prosecution to be instituted against us as felons. Hear what the Governor says, [Mr. May here read from the Governor's speech] 'Every thing that tends to disturb the relations created by this compact (the Constitution) is at war with its spirit; and whatever, by direct and necessary operation, is calculated to excite an insurrection among the slaves, has been held by highly respectable, legal authority, an offence against the peace of this Commonwealth, which may be prosecuted as a misdemeanor, at common law.'

Now, who is to be the judge of what is calculated to excite insurrection among the slaves? The Governor goes on to say, 'Although opinions may differ on this point, it would seem the safer course, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, to imitate the example of our fathers, the Adamses, the Hancocks, and other eminent patriots of the revolution, who, although fresh from the battles of liberty, and approaching the question as essentially an open one, deemed it, nevertheless, expedient to enter into a union with our brothers of the slaveholding States, on the principle of forbearance and toleration on this subject.'

All that is very true; and has not the country forborne and tolerated this abomination long enough? And did the patriots of the revolution ever advise a resort to mobs, or to the enactment of laws against the liberty of speech whenever the people should think the sin of slavery ought to be tolerated no longer? Did they say, that one part of the Constitution was more sacred than another—and must it not even be talked about? Where is the authority of the Adamses and the Hancocks, for appealing to the pee-

ple, in the name of patriotism, to abandon the right of free discussion? Where have they told us, that while we may freely discuss, and change every compact in the Constitution, and the whole Constitution itself; whenever the people say so, yet we must not speak against slavery? The Governor then says—‘As the genius of our institutions and the character of our people are entirely repugnant to laws impairing the liberty of speech, and of the press, even for the sake of repressing its abuses’—Sound doctrine this, if it had stopped there, but what follows, how far is His Excellency willing we should go in using this liberty of speech, and the press? Mark the appendage—‘the *patriotism* of all classes of citizens must be invoked, to abstain from a discussion, which, by exasperating the master, can have no other effect than to render more oppressive the condition of the slave; and which, if not abandoned, there is great reason to fear, will prove the rock on which the Union will split.’

This is the insinuation against abolitionists as disunionists, as enemies of their country, which, in their behalf, I repudiate with my whole soul! And this is patriotism, this is the love of liberty, to tolerate slavery, and forever shut our mouths, saying aught against it! This is the appeal to patriotism, to the patriotism of those, who are indirectly charged with a design to dissolve the Union! His Excellency did not venture fully to express the sentiment he has insinuated in this part of the address. He assumes, that, whatever is done to abolish slavery, that what we are doing now here to day, only exasperates the master, and increases the evils of slavery. This is the language of our worst opponents here, put into their mouths by the slaveholders of the South. It is specious, but it is not founded in reason or fact. What does it say? Why, that our preaching up the cruelty of slavery, as a reason why it should be abolished, and exciting public opinion against it, on that very account, will make the masters still more cruel to their slaves. The argument is, that those who are laboring to show the mildness of slavery, and the blessings it confers on the slaves, in order to put down the abolitionists, will go on and do worse than even the very things of which the abolitionists accuse them! No, sir. They know that every additional rivet they put upon the fetters of the slave, only hastens abolition. Our southern brethren know, that the eye of the world is now on them, observing their treatment of their slaves, and they will take care not to increase the odium against slavery by *added* cruelty. Sir, I look upon the efforts of the abolitionists in this country, and Europe, as forming the greatest possible protection for the slave. For his own sake the master dare not vent his exasperation against abolitionists on the unoffending slave. Every additional blow he should give, would be an argument for emancipation. No, sir. The slaveholder is now endeavoring to show, that slavery is a very happy condition. At the South now, they call it by the softened name of a *domestic institution*; and they are laboring to make it appear, that it is, what one of their governors has described it as being, a *patri-*

*archal* institution! It will spoil Governor M'Duffie's argument, if they do as our Governor says, they will render more oppressive the condition of the slave.' No, sir, instead of increasing the sufferings of the slaves, it will diminish them.

Sir, is this groundless apprehension to deter men from speaking their thoughts, who are banded together by the solemn ties of Christianity, and by the love of liberty, and hatred of oppression, before God and the world, to overthrow this monster that preys upon the vitals of our free institutions? To talk against slavery, will 'prove the rock on which the Union will split.' So says the Chief Magistrate of this free Commonwealth. You must not talk against slavery, for fear of destroying liberty! Does not that gentleman believe in the overruling Providence of God? and does he not believe that God will require at our hands, the blood of the slave? Does he believe in 'the declaration of equality in the Bill of Rights,' to which his address refers? and can he believe that slavery can go on, and our free institutions much longer subsist with it? Does he not, as a statesman, see that the rock on which the Union will split, is not free discussion, but the inevitable conflict between free labor and slave labor, if the latter is not abolished? Is it not apparent to him, and has he never heard the warning of it in the Halls of Congress, that there has long been a struggle going on to place the freemen of the North on a level with the slaves of the South, and to make the *North subservient to the South*? His Excellency speaks of the 'compact' touching slavery. Is there no compact touching freedom? Where are our immunities in other states, as citizens of the United States, which are secured by the compact? As was said yesterday, the Union is practically dissolved, the Constitution is no longer the supreme law of the land. The Constitution secures to us the freedom of speech, but we cannot enjoy the immunities of the Constitution as citizens, unless we shut our mouths! If we speak, we are told we shall dissolve the Union. When we talk of remonstrating to our rulers, a right secured by the Constitution, we are told this is no grievance of yours, and you have no right to complain of it. Remonstrate against your own grievances, if you like, but this belongs to the South. Sir, are we not citizens of this Republic? Are not the rulers of the South, our rulers—and are we not compelled to deliver up the slave to his master—are we not liable to be called upon to aid the master in crushing the slave, in case of insurrection—are we not, in the eyes of the nations of the earth, and in the sight of Heaven, compelled to bear the sin, and shame, and disgrace of this blot of slavery on our land? Is it no grievance of ours, that one fifth of our whole population, our countrymen, are bowed to the earth by oppression, and denied the attributes of men? Is it no grievance of ours, that we exhibit so monstrous an inconsistency to the world—a nation claiming to be the champion and the great exemplar of liberty—sending forth its heralds of the gospel of peace to the uttermost parts of the earth, and yet holding in chains,

at home, and boasting of it as a part of our 'domestic institutions,' two millions and a half of our countrymen, to whom are denied all the rights of men, all the sympathies of humanity, and all the lights of the gospel? Sir, I am ashamed of my countrymen of the North, when I hear them say it is no grievance of ours, that millions of our countrymen at the South, are ground to the dust by the despotism of slavery! Sir, it is enough for me to answer to all this, that I am a man, and whatever concerns man concerns me. This was the sentiment of a heathen philosopher, centuries ago, for which his name shall be had in everlasting remembrance; and shall a Christian, a citizen of these United States, be satisfied with a sentiment less noble, less generous, less universal than this? No, sir, I cannot yield my assent to these doctrines laid down in His Excellency's address. They are not the doctrines of our fathers, they are not the doctrines of freedom:—what an insinuation it is, in a land of liberty, that *patriotism* requires I should be silent, and utter not a word against the enslavement of millions of my countrymen! Sir, I spurn such patriotism.

MR. MILLIGAN—Reminded the assembly, that this was a solemn pledge they were about to make—never to relinquish the cause of free discussion, never to surrender or abandon it. We have been called to suffer in this cause by the lawless violence of mobs. We know not how soon it may be made lawful for mobs to assail us, and haul us, men and women to prison, for speaking in the name of freedom. Are we prepared to suffer, even unto death, if it shall be necessary to carry out this pledge? I hope we shall duly regard its solemnity—the deep responsibility we assume by this vote, taken in the presence of God, and of one another. Peter promised, but Peter denied his Lord. Let us be prepared for the day of trial. Let us be fortified with God's almighty rampart of truth and faith, to stand up, and redeem our pledge before men and angels, *never to abandon the right of free discussion.*

[THE PRESIDENT of the Convention now requested the audience to be seated, and all present, including the ladies, whether members of the Convention or not, were invited to vote. The resolution was read, and the question put: as many as are in favor of this resolution will signify it by rising. The whole Congregation of about 1400 persons rose, it is believed without a single exception. Those in the negative were requested to rise. No one rose, and it was pronounced a unanimous vote.]

### THIRD DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

The Convention met at 9 o'clock, on Thursday morning, May 26, according to adjournment.

Hymn by the Choir.

Prayer by Ira M. Bidwell, of Lowell.

[Rev. Dr. Channing, of Boston, was present during the forenoon session.]

The following resolution, offered by Mr. Grosvenor the day previous, was now called up, viz:—

*Whereas* the events of the last three years, touching the education of our colored brethren, abundantly prove, that a most deep-rooted and cruel opposition extensively exists to their elevation and improvement, in consequence of which the 'Oneida Institute' is the only literary institution, east of Ohio, where it is officially announced that colored students can enjoy equal privileges with others in a collegiate course of education; and whereas, an attempt has been made to crush this institution by legislative proscription, therefore—

*Resolved*, That it be earnestly recommended to Abolitionists to bestow on Oneida Institute their patronage and support, so that it may be placed above pecuniary embarrassment, and be furnished with every requisite facility for carrying forward its pupils in its prescribed course of studies to the best advantage.

MR. GROSVENOR, of Salem, in offering the resolution said, he would barely remark, that the very best means of crushing prejudice against the colored race, is to bring out and present to the public well educated colored men. All our arguments and theories will go for nothing unless we back them up by facts. Yesterday, when I listened to the remarks of our brother Wright, I felt that the moral and intellectual claims of Africa had been practically defended. I felt that one demonstration like this, of what education, though partial, can do without regard to skin, was doing more to break up the prejudice against the colored race for supposed mental incapacity, than all we could do by argument or appeal. I thought that if Greece was to appeal to us for aid, who could plead her cause so well as an educated Greek? How intently would he be listened to. And now, Africa is pleading for her race, who can plead so well for her as one of the descendants of the sons of Africa? I felt that we had the intellectual power, if we could educate these men and bring them forward to plead the cause of their race. Now I want to see that power increased a thousand fold, through the means of our literary institutions, by educated colored youths. This consideration especially commends to us this resolution.



MR. LOSS, of the Faculty of the Oneida Institute, supported the resolution, and gave a very interesting statement of facts respecting that institution, showing that it proffers much greater advantages to young colored men than they could obtain elsewhere. [By a vote of the Convention, Mr. Loss was requested to furnish a report of the statement for publication, but he has not done so. The reporter, presuming that Mr. Loss would avail himself of so good an opportunity to present the claims of the Institution, which he represented, to the public, did not take any notes.]

REV. MR. BLAIN of Rhode Island, moved to strike out that part, 'whereas an attempt has been made to crush this Institution, by legislative proscription'—he was in favor of the resolution, but would avoid coming in conflict with the legislature of New York, and its pro-slavery spirit.

REV. MOSES THACHER, of Mass., was sorry to disagree with the gentleman, but he could not see why we should not express our opinions as freely of legislative acts, as of the acts of literary institutions. If we have a right to disapprove of the conduct of literary institutions, why not of legislative bodies also, and of executive acts? It is well known that the spirit of abolition has been attempted to be crushed by legislative and executive influence, and is it not our duty, as citizens of the United States, to express a holy indignation at every attempt to put down free discussion?

MR. ——— Hoped that the amendment would die a quick and easy death. The Senate of New York had undertaken to brand this institution with sedition. What right had that Senate to interfere with the literary institutions of the people for educating their children? [At the suggestion of Messrs. May and Stanton, some alteration was made in the language of the resolution, and the amendment was withdrawn.]

REV. THEODORE WRIGHT, of New York. Mr. President, I wish, on this subject, to express my feelings, but the time will not admit. This is practical abolition. This is laying the axe at the root of the tree; for, however you may feel and act, much is to be done for emancipation through the colored population. This must be done by giving them means of improvement—throwing the light of religion into their minds—giving them opportunities of acquiring literature, science, and the mechanic arts, This Institution is valuable for that purpose. I know it, for I have felt the want of it. When I desired to get an education for the ministry, and was approved for that purpose, in a church surrounded with the most enlightened men, I had to remain six months in New York, under the control of the Presbytery, before I could find a place to fit for college. I tried to get into a grammar school in Connecticut, and was excluded. The teacher came to my father, with tears in his eyes, and said, I cannot

admit your son. I have no objections myself, but it will not do. I should lose all my scholars. I do not know of any institution but this in Oneida, where colored young men can get a classical education. It is pretended there is no regulation in the New England colleges which excludes colored students. I have carried colored pupils to these colleges. The professors will say, there is no rule to exclude you, but we think you had better not apply. We had to send the young men to Ohio. Six colored young men from New York, are in the Institute at Oneida doing well. This Institution is my hope. It will train my brethren, colored young men, to instruct their colored brethren. Look at New Haven, at Canterbury, Conn., at Canaan, N. H. and you will see how they treat the attempts to give the colored people any thing like a fair chance with the whites, for education. They keep us down, drive us out of their schools, mob and break up our own schools, and then point at us in scorn as an inferior race of men. 'Can't learn anything!' Why don't they let us try? Why are they afraid to let our children have the same chance theirs do, for getting an education? If they fall behind them, and could make nothing, then they might, with justice, call us an inferior race. Some of the young men driven from Canaan, are at Oneida. God is there teaching abolition, by training the young men together, white and colored. The most efficient co-operation I ever received, was from those with whom I have associated in the seats of learning, my respected classmates. They have always been ready to aid and counsel me. My heart has always gladdened to see them. Since I have been in this city, one, who grew up with me from boyhood, came up and shook my hand as a friend. It shows they have not forgot. They never made me feel that they thought me beneath them. It is from such men I have received the greatest encouragement in my ministry. It is important to make the two races feel kindness and respect to each other. Even if but few do so, it will have an effect on others. Get two men to love each other, of different nations, and it will make them love the whole class. I feel happy when I can make one man my friend, for I think I can then interest him for poor down-trodden Africa.

REV. MR. THURSTON, of Maine—Wished to inquire, if it were strictly true, that Oneida Institute was the only college east of Ohio, in which colored pupils could be received?

Some one said, that pupils would be received at the Wilbraham Academy.

MR. THURSTON said—That a colored person had been educated at Bowdoin College, Maine, and received equal advantages with the white students. He knew of no other having applied. He did not know how, if asked, he could make it appear strictly true, that no college but Oneida, would receive colored pupils.

REV. MR. THACHER, of Mass., said—That prejudice must be taken into the account. The New England colleges might not exclude colored students, but they encouraged a prejudice which created an atmosphere in which a colored student could not live. He could not be on equal terms with his classmates, and at every step in improvement was compelled to drag the heavy chain which prejudice had bound to him. In the Oneida Institute this prejudice was not suffered to exist. It was crushed in the germ. It was a prejudice peculiar to America. It existed in no other part of the globe, and so long as it existed in our colleges, no colored student could be admitted there to equal advantages with white pupils.

*A young gentleman* in the broad aisle (whose name we could not learn) said—That he was a student at Amherst College, in Mass., a few years ago. One of his classmates was a colored young man, of the name of Jones. He was admitted to the friendship, intimacy, and kindness of the whole College. He roomed with the white students, and in all their exercises and amusements freely associated with them. They treated him as cordially as they did any fellow student, and he knew of no reason why colored students would not be received at Amherst, and treated as kindly as any others.

MR. E. WRIGHT, of New York, said—He knew of a formal application made to the Trustees of Amherst College, whether they would receive men of color. They refused to publish any such notice to the world. It was true, that individuals might be received there, and treated kindly, but the institution would not keep open its doors as the Oneida College had done. At Williams' College they were willing to receive a colored pupil, who was almost white, provided he would agree to go to Liberia. They said, they could not afford to oppose Southern prejudice against abolition. Amherst will not open its doors, publicly, to colored pupils.

REV. MR. GROSVENOR, of Mass. That is important. I respect Amherst, and know the Faculty to be men of worth. But they will not open their doors, publicly, although he believed there was no direct opposition to abolition there. An anti-slavery society had been discouraged there, yet one was formed, and nearly 100 students of the College joined it. No objection was made by the Faculty. He lectured to them.

REV. MR. BLAIN, of Rhode Island. The Oneida Institute is the only institution, east of Ohio, where it is publicly made known, that colored students can enjoy equal privileges with others. This is what we mean.

REV. MR. FITCH, of Boston. That is the pith of the matter. The New England colleges may have a friendly feeling on the subject, but they don't like to have it known that they admit colored pupils, for fear of

losing Southern students. Like many other people, they are good abolitionists, so far as it will not hurt their trade.

GEN. FESSENDEN, of Maine. The professors in the College of Maine, are abolitionists, and one of them actively so, who would be glad to extend the same privileges to colored as to white students.

MR. CAPLES, of Boston. If I enter the Institution, I want to enter as a man, and go through as a man. I know we can get into college, by getting into favor of the Faculty, and brushing boots, and making fires for the students. We can run the gauntlet on our hands and knees, and get through as servants, but if we have one drop of African blood in our veins, it excludes us from all sympathy, and all equality. Young men who are bowed down so, can never rise up like men.

REV. MR. PRATT, of Medford, said—He was not a member of the Convention, but was connected with Amherst College, when Jones was educated there. Jones was a person of decided influence in the College. He doubted if any one exercised more influence with the students. He surpassed one third of the class in his studies, and it was matter of deep regret, that he did not come up to the highest point, in the severer studies. He believed that the very circumstance of Jones' color gave him more privileges and more sympathy. Mr. Pratt said, he wished the facts might be fairly stated. He felt an interest in the cause, though opposed to the high pressure of immediate abolition. His heart was with the Convention, and he believed they would be desirous of having the truth of this matter. [Mr. Pratt was asked how black Jones was.] He described him as a very light mulatto. That made no difference. He was every where known as a person of color. Amherst, he said, did not advertise that they would receive colored pupils, neither did they advertise that they would receive pupils with red hair, but none who applied had ever been rejected.

*A gentleman* said—He knew Jones. He was nearly white. Was a young man of remarkable talent for ingratiating himself—The speaker was a member of the College with Jones. His father possessed immense wealth in New York, and that gave him the influence spoken of. He was also a genteel young man, and of excellent disposition.

The motion was put on the resolution, and carried with one negative. A reconsideration was then moved, and the gentleman who voted in the negative requested to give his reason. He was

MR. WEBSTER, of New Hampton, N. H., who said—He was a full blooded abolitionist, but he could not believe that the colleges of New England had ever refused to receive persons of color. He did not think that anything would be gained by calling on them to come out and say, they will re-

ceive black men, but he believed they would receive any number of colored young men, properly qualified. He had been a student of Dartmouth College, and he was sure that any colored person would be received there, and treated kindly. A majority of the students there, are abolitionists.

MR. E. WRIGHT, of New York, said—That within three years, application had been made to every college in New England, and they will not say, that they will receive colored students. What security had we, if we patronised a college with a view to promote the education of colored young men, the college would not, the moment a public stir should be made, here or at the South, send them away. By passing this resolution we do not denounce the Northern colleges. We only say, that Oneida College is the only one, that is openly pledged to receive colored students the same as white students. The adoption of this resolution would be a test by which to ascertain whether any college but Oneida could be opened to the colored student.

REV. IRA M. BIDWELL. The question is, is any college now open? There are no facts to show that there is. We have facts, that two or three colored persons have got through college. I am glad of it, but that is no proof, that any college is as free to the colored as to the white student.

REV. MR. WRIGHT, of Boston. The objection is, that the resolution does not tell the truth. If it does not, put it down. But it says, that Oneida Institute is the only literary institution, east of Ohio, where it is *officially announced*, that colored pupils are admitted. Is not this so? The resolution, therefore, tells the plain truth, and nothing but the truth.

[With this explanation, the resolution was again put, and passed *unanimously*.]

On motion of NATHANIEL SOUTHARD,

*Resolved*, That while we approve of the plan of diffusing publications adopted by the American Anti-Slavery Society, we would earnestly recommend the abolitionists of New England to continue and increase their patronage to those publications which are established among us, some of which, from their early establishment, from the difficulties they have encountered, and the sacrifices they have cost, have peculiar claims upon the countenance and support of all the friends of impartial liberty.

On motion of JAMES BALLARD, of Vermont, the following preamble and resolution were unanimously adopted.

Inasmuch as the *negro* is a MAN, and has never forfeited his rights by crime, therefore,

*Resolved*, That all the rights which belong to man, as such, belong to him; and that no men or body of men can interfere with these rights, without assuming to themselves the prerogatives of Jehovah.

MR. BALLARD—Supported his resolution by an able argument, (evinced by a sound and intelligent mind) based upon general principles of hu-

man rights, and repelled the assertion, that the Bible sanctions the system of slavery, which exists in this country. At the close of his remarks, Mr. Ballard informed the Convention, that the Academy in Bennington, Vermont, of which he is Principal, was thrown open to colored youth. He had made this fact publicly known. The finger of scorn had been pointed at him—‘There goes the *negro teacher*.’ That he did not mind, if he could aid in breaking down the prejudice that now crushed the colored race.

On motion of ELIZUR WRIGHT,

*Resolved*, That the appeal of slaveholders to the Bible, for the support of their nefarious system of turning men into merchandise, is plainly shown to be hypocritical, by their refusal to permit the slave to have possession of the Bible.

Adjourned, till 3 o'clock, P. M.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

Met according to adjournment, 3 o'clock, P. M.

Hymn by the Choir.

MR. FITCH offered the following :—

*Resolved*, That the cry about the dissolution of the Union, which comes up from the South, and is echoed back by the North, is a mere bugbear to frighten us away from our duty; and that, when the white men of the North can be emancipated from their slavery of prejudice and ignorance on this subject, the slave of the South must go free.

Mr. Fitch sustained his resolution, by the following remarks :—

Mr. President—Our friends at the South are so much accustomed to the use of the scourge, that they seem not to doubt that they can scourge us into obedience; and that even the threat of doing so, will be sufficient to subject us to their will. So soon as we are disposed to talk of any thing which is not according to their wishes, the cry comes upon us, ‘Shut your mouth or we will dissolve the Union.’ Now, sir, this cry about dissolving the Union is one upon which I am disposed to smile, even contemptuously. Why, sir, the South are dependent on us, and they show that they feel dependent on us for protection, and for the maintenance of their very institution of slavery; and yet they would have us to believe that they wish to dissolve the Union!

What do the men of the South say when they come among us? A southern gentleman not long ago, in a public meeting, attempted an illustration of what he regarded as the true state of things at the South. We are standing, said he, like a man in a room, every part of which is covered with powder a cubit thick; and he with a live coal in his hands. It burns him; he cannot hold it, and yet he dares not throw it down.

Another gentleman from the far South, remarked in my hearing, ‘Ev-

ery agitation of the subject of slavery among you, comes down upon us at the South like the tones of muttering thunder.' Such, sir, is their terror, arising from their own slaves; and they know that the Constitution of the United States binds us to protect them, and yet they will talk to us about dissolving the Union.

I know that the men of the South would not give us credit for as much skill in the use of the pistol as they have; and probably they are right. We can use the implements of industry much better than the implements of death. They would not allow that we were up to the sticking point of blowing out each other's brains quite as much as they—and doubtless they are correct. We had rather be called cowards twice, than to stand up to be shot ourselves, or to shoot our fellow-men, when we see no object to be gained by it.

But they would, perhaps, be willing to admit, that we have 'jist a lee-tle bit of a notion' about the use of a musket, so that we could see sufficiently straight to shoot a black man at a reasonable distance; and they would regard it as a very comfortable thing for us to come down there, and do their negro hunting for them, when they shall have become so much terified that they dare not peep out of their holes. And yet, they would have us think, that they are disposed to dissolve the Union.

I know a southern gentleman, who has recently said, in New York, that they are no more afraid of the blacks than of so many frogs; but I suspect we might get up our public meetings, and erect our platforms, and make our long speeches, and have a very free discussion about the evils of frog ponds, without hearing all this uproarious cry of peace, be still. Why, sir, are they so much afraid of our free discussions, except that they know, that these discussions are fast enlisting the whole sympathies of the North in behalf of the poor slave; beating down that wall of prejudice in which the system of slavery has its chief defence. They know that when the whole North, shall come up to mingle its voice with that thundering peal which comes rolling across the Atlantic, in defence of equal rights, they will not be able to endure the tremendous mutterings that will come down upon them. The slave will hear, and will start up in something of the dignity of his own manhood to claim his rights, and with the whole world to cheer him on, *he will be free*.

Do you think, sir, the South will dissolve the Union, and leave themselves in the hands of their own slaves, when they are in so much terror because of them now, with the whole North to call upon for their defence? Just look at the South, in case the Union were dissolved. Their slaves in the midst of them, of whom they are now in fear, Mexico beyond them, contending with them already, on this very point, and the multitudinous tribes of Indians around them, all of whom regard the South as the authors of their wrongs, and who, though hostile to each other in some instances, would gladly unite against the whites! Why, sir, what would become of them? Just about what happened to Jonah when he was thrown overboard. They would be swallowed up, and it is

not at all certain that they would be vomitted up again on dry land. And yet we are gravely told, that our free discussions about slavery, are 'the rock' on which the Union is to be 'split.' Why, sir, the men of the South *know*, that if they split the Union on this rock, they will just split their own heads. They may pretend they are such fools as to desire it; but really, I have too much respect for their understanding to believe any such thing.

They are afraid to have our prejudices destroyed, because they cannot then look to us for help, and cannot without us, preserve their institution of slavery.

Besides, they need our market for their slave productions. They cannot afford to give it up. Some splendid fortunes are made, perhaps, by slavery; but, as a whole, it is an unprofitable concern. 'I own,' said a southern planter, '300 negroes. I raise a great quantity of corn, and fatten a large number of hogs. But I find, at the end of the year, that my hogs have eaten my corn, and my negroes have eaten my hogs, and I am just where I was when the year commenced.'

They are poor, as it is, and they cannot afford to give up the profits of our market, of which they might be deprived, when we were thoroughly abolitionised. Hence, their unwillingness to have us speak of the subject. But they are coming up gloriously to our help. A few more annual messages from Gov. M'Duffie, and a few more speeches from Mr. Clay, telling our Northern laborers that they ought to be slaves, and the whole North will be carried. They are doing the work with far greater despatch, by sending such papers to us, than we could do it, by sending our abolitionism to them. The spirit of our northern yeomanry will hardly brook being called slaves.

Let us go on, sir. A few more efforts and these northern prejudices will be consumed, and when the flame shall go up, full, and clear, and broad, upon the face of heaven, slavery must perish in the same fire, and its smoke will arise, as incense, acceptable to God.

#### On motion of MR. JOHN E. FULLER:—

*Resolved*, That this Convention give their unqualified approbation to that distinguished friend of the slave, James G. Birney, and cheerfully recommend to all the friends of immediate emancipation, to patronize the *Philanthropist* to the fullest extent of their ability, while its editor so nobly volunteers to jeopard his life, in the midst of dangers and persecutions.

#### On motion of WILLIAM L. GARRISON:—

*Resolved*, That the enthusiastic welcome extended to our friend and fellow-laborer, George Thompson, by the friends of human rights in great Britain, gives additional proof of what, to the candid, was sufficiently evident before, that his character is above the reach of his traducers, that his mission was undertaken from the purest philanthropy, and that our country can never enjoy the reputation of a generous and Christian nation, until she responds to the voice of George Thompson, by proclaiming liberty to all her inhabitants.

*Resolved*, That we view with delight and encouragement the noble efforts of the philanthropists of Great Britain, for the abolition of slavery throughout the world.



Both of the foregoing resolutions, were unanimously adopted with marked approbation.

On motion of MR. THACHER :—

*Resolved*, That the system of American slavery is opposed to all the moral and benevolent enterprises of the age.

MR. THACHER said—That the insinuation had been repeatedly thrown out, that the abolitionists, as a class, intended to divert the attention of the Christian public from the great benevolent objects of the day, and this had been urged as an important objection against the discussion of the subject of slavery—that they were drying up the sources of christian benevolence, and intended to turn every thing into a political channel. This he denied, and proceeded to show, that American slavery was the great antagonist of moral and religious improvements, and that this obstacle must first be removed, before the efforts of Christians, in other respects, could be crowned with success.

One of the great objects of the age, was the dissemination of the scriptures. American slavery was the enemy of the Bible societies. They may vote that the Bible shall be put into the hands of every man, but the slavery system steps in, and says, that two millions and a half of our fellow-beings, here, in the United States, shall not receive the Bible. And even if they were permitted to receive it, the system of slavery prohibits nine-tenths of them from reading the Bible. This is the system which abolition opposes, by seeking to enlighten this class of our fellow-men, and open the Bible to them as well as to others.

Slavery was also the enemy of domestic missions. The Bible says—‘Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.’ This is the command of Christ. Slavery says, you shall not preach to two and a half millions of men, women, and children. This class is excluded from the light of the gospel.

The tract enterprise, was another great moral and religious engine. Slavery stands in the way, and says, that tracts shall not be circulated among two millions and a half of our own countrymen. You may enlighten others, but these must be kept in ignorance, for the benefit of their masters! Suppose a slave, who can read, collects his fellows together, after their day’s work, and attempts to read a tract to them, on any subject? Will the overseer permit him to do so? No, sir. The cat is at hand, the cowhide is applied, the quiet assembly is dispersed, and the slave, who attempted to read to them, is punished with thirty-nine or one hundred lashes.

Sunday schools, are another great enterprise of the age. Slavery is the enemy of Sunday schools. By the laws of the Southern States, teaching the children of slaves, in a Sunday school, is a heinous offence. An assembly of blacks, for Sabbath school instruction, is held to be a riotous meeting, which may be dispersed, as a mob, by any white man. Sunday school teachers have been punished, threatened, and imprisoned.

Here are four of the principal moral and benevolent enterprises of the age, all opposed by slavery. Thus, it appears, that we must get rid of slavery, in order to carry on these great enterprises. Can the Millenium come, and find slavery here? Can the knowledge of the Lord cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, while slavery exists among us? If Christians pray for the Millenium, then should they be earnestly engaged to propagate the doctrine of immediate emancipation.

The resolution passed unanimously.

REV. MR. WOODBURY, of Acton, offered the following:—

*Resolved*, That this Convention do approve of the resolutions which have been adopted by the Presbytery of Chillicothe, and do also urgently recommend the practical enforcement of them, universally, and without further delay.

1. *Resolved*, That the buying, selling, or holding a slave for the sake of gain, is a heinous sin and scandal, and requires the cognizance of the judicatories of the church.
2. That giving or bequeathing slaves to children or others, as property, is a great sin, and when committed by church members, ought to subject them to censure.
3. That to sell a slave his own liberty, except when the slave was purchased at his own request, and has failed to remunerate his master for the price paid, is a great injustice, and ought to exclude from our communion.
4. That to offer a slave his freedom, only on condition that he will leave his country, and go into a foreign land, is unjust, and ought to subject a church member to censure.
5. That when a slave is emancipated, whose services have been of much value to his master, refusing to give him a reasonable compensation for his labor, when his master is able to do it; or turning him out to the world, when he wishes to stay as a tenant or hireling, is a grievous sin, and when committed by a member of the church, ought to subject him to suspension until he repent.
6. That when a master advertises a reward for a runaway slave, against whom no other crime is alleged than escaping from slavery, he is guilty of a scandalous sin, and forfeits his right to the sealing ordinances of God's house.
7. That to apprehend a slave, who is endeavoring to escape from slavery, with a view to restore him to his master, is a direct violation of the divine law, and when committed by a church member, ought to subject him to censure.
8. That any member of our church, who shall advocate, or speak in favor of such laws as have been, or may be enacted for the purpose of keeping the slaves in ignorance, or preventing them from learning to read the word of God, is guilty of a great sin, and ought to be dealt with as for other scandalous crimes.
9. That should any member of our church be so wicked as to manifest a desire to exclude colored people from a seat in the house of God, or at the Lord's Table, with white people, he ought, on conviction thereof, to be suspended from the Lord's Table, until he repents.

MR. J. T. WOODBURY, of Acton, said—These were the emphatic resolutions of the Presbytery of Ohio. They come from the right source. Why? Because the Church is defiled with the sin of slavery. It is in the power of the Church to do much, by doing its duty. It is in the power of the Church to say, that they will not put their lips to the cup, nor break bread with the slaveholder, while his hands are stained with a brother's blood. The work done by this Presbytery is rightfully done. They have not meddled with that which was 'none of their business.' It belonged to them to feel deeply, and speak, and act decidedly on this matter. It is not merely the cause of suffering humanity, but pre-eminently the cause of the suffering children of God. Among the millions of slaves, many are professed and acknowledged members of the Church. They are those who believe in Jesus Christ—those whom he

deigns to call his brethren, and concerning whom he said, 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.' The Church has a peculiar duty to perform in this matter, the duty of protecting their own members, not against the world, but against one another—the duty of preventing church members *from selling one another*, from robbing one another of the Bible, and from compelling one another to work without wages. What is the Church doing? Selling indulgences for sin—the worst of sins—the sin of *man-stealing*—yea, the sin of stealing and selling *a brother in the Church!* What do they do? The hammer is lifted over the head of the Christian—yes, the Christian, the child of God—and the cry is, who bids? Brother sells his brother, and the Church says, it *it is all right*, while the watchmen, on the walls of Zion, pass the word, *all's well!* Though the auctioneer is a church member, the seller, and buyer, and the poor slave, all members of the same Church, yet the Church does not censure the deed. *It is all right.*

Here is the first stone to be turned, and it must be turned in the Church. If the Church does not interfere, if it does not punctually and faithfully exercise its right of correcting such abuses, then it is dead while it has a name to live. It has been well said, by a member of the Presbyterian church, distinguished, as much for his profound learning, as for his sound piety, that, if the Church did not abolish slavery, slavery would abolish the Church. Yes, Mr. President, I can see, you can see, all can see, that this great moral maelstrom is fast dragging down into its vortex, not the ark of our political safety only, but the ark of our God. It is enough to see our Declaration of Independence, that great bill of human rights, trampled on, and sneered at as a mere 'rhetorical flourish;' but it is something more to see this grim monster of oppression, placing his iron heel and bloody hand upon the Bible. The patriot may well tremble for his country, but the discerning Christian trembles for the Church. How can we expect men of the world to respect the Church, when they see ministers of the gospel, exchanging their own church members for beasts, and selling them like cattle in the market?

What do we do when slavery comes here, in the shape of a slaveholding minister? Why, sir, slavery can stand here in the pulpit, and preach from the Oracles of God. Slavery can stand there, at the Communion Table, and break the bread of life, with the same hand that fastens the fetters on a christian brother who is a slave! Has the Church nothing to do? This they can do. They can say, that slavery shall not here expound the word of God to our churches, nor administer the holy sacraments, till the great sin is repented of. The Church that does not pronounce slavery a sin, and deal with its members, who refuse to confess and forsake it, in effect, licenses slavery. It stands as the virtual endorser of the crime. If men are robbed of the Bible, and of all knowledge of letters, if parents are punished, as felons, for teaching their own children the alphabet, and the Church does nothing, then the Church, by its silence, endorses it, and declares it is all right. If parents are robbed of

their children, forced to see them dragged to the market, and knocked off to the negro speculator—the Church stands by, and says, '*It's all right.*' The Church allows this, not only in its members, but in its elders, and deacons, and pastors, and bishops, and hence it stands justly responsible for selling indulgences to licence the sin of slavery.

This is the state of the Church at the South. How is it at the North? Here the Church freely admits to its communion and fellowship, and welcomes to its pulpits, men who make merchandize of souls, who hold their fellow-men, their fellow-christians, as property, as things, as slaves—property to be attached by their creditors, or inherited by their heirs. Does not the Church that accounts all this no ground of reproof to the brother, guilty of such enormity, in the sight of God, virtually approve it all? The Church here puts its lips to the same cup with these men, and tells the world aloud, that the conduct of these men merits no censure or reproof. They are as good Christians as were the apostles and disciples; and thus the Church here licenses slavery, and says, '*It is all right—all's well.*' Yes, it is well to buy and sell men, to hold your own brother in Christ, as a slave, as property, a thing to traffic with. What is it to us, says the church here, if our brethren at the South do buy and sell church members? Now, sir if the Church here can be indifferent to the buying and selling of church members, they would be indifferent if Jesus Christ himself were a slave, and bought and sold by professing christians! Christ so judges. He and his brethren are identified:—'Inasmuch as ye did it unto these, my brethren, ye did it unto me.' We cannot plead ignorance, and what the Church knows to exist, among her members, and does not rebuke she approves.

Sir, I see the vortex, and I fear that the Church of Christ will be overwhelmed in it, if she does not make haste to escape. The wisdom of the Chillicothe resolves, is seen in thus consulting the safety of the Church. How long shall a christianity, which tolerates the licentiousness and despotism of modern slavery be better than rank heathenism? How long will Christians be able to boast of more purity than pagans, if christian churches allow their members to buy and sell each other, to rob each other of the Bible, to compel each other to work without wages? What! shall the American churches form Bible societies, and pledge themselves before God, that they will give the Bible to the whole world, and then withhold it from twenty-five hundred thousand souls in their very midst? What have we seen here? A Virginia christian slaveholder comes here, and appeals to us about the Virginia State Bible Society, to send the Bible to the extreme ends of the earth. Yes, sir. Virginia sends out her eloquent agent, Mr. Plummer, or some body else, to raise funds from the North, to help them send the Bible to the Chinese and the Hindoo, and all the while they refuse to give it to the two and a half millions of souls perishing for the bread of life, at their very thresholds, within their very dwellings! Yes, sir, they not only refuse to do it themselves, but will imprison, mob, and murder us if we attempt to do it for them! Sir, the

Secretary of this same Virginia Bible Society, which sends to the North for funds to enable its members to pour forth their christian benevolence upon the Chinese and the Hindoo, has boasted, that he is a great slaveholder. Why don't he give the Bible to his own slaves then, and teach them to read it, before he asks for our money to help him send Bibles to the slaves in sin in distant lands? How does he look; the agent of the Virginia Bible Society, begging for money, to give the Bible to Chinese men and Hindoo parabs, and refusing to give it, or let us give it, to *six hundred thousand immortal beings in his own State?* Why, what a hypocrite! Is there a being on earth, the most degraded even of the miserable slaves, whose souls are left to perish, who cannot see the inconsistency, the absurdity, the hypocrisy of this? Is God a fool to be thus mocked? Sir, I will raise my voice against such hypocrisy as long as I live. It shall ring in the ears of every slaveholder who asks us to help him give Bibles to the heathen, thousands of miles off, while he withholds them from the slaves at his own door. Why, his very Bibles, which he sends to the Hindoo, are bought with the blood and souls of his slaves. It is dividing the gains of hell with God. I wish it were written on every Bible sent forth by Bible societies of slaveholders—'*This was bought with the blood of our slaves, who are not permitted to read it!*' What would the heathen say to it? 'Go home with your Bible, and first learn from it to free your slaves, before you send it here to teach us.' Sir, it is the rankest hypocrisy the world ever witnessed, and I wish it were written on the whole heavens! A Bible society! do they call it? Sir, it is a Bible-robbing society. It begins with robbing the slave of the Bible, and then takes the earnings of the slave, to buy Bibles to send to the heathen! It robs the Christian here of the Bible, to send it to the worshipper of Juggernaut in India. If this is Christianity, well might the heathen say, God defend us from such Christianity!

Now, sir, this is the naked view of the subject, stripped of all disguises. It is covered up by the apologist for slavery. They put in the front rank of slaveholders, the ministers, deacons, and church members—they tell you how good and pious these men are, and then ask if slavery can be a bad thing, when it is countenanced by such men? We are made to see only the ministers, and elders, and church members, and to soften down slavery by associating it with their piety and high standing in the Church.

How did a similar plan operate, for a long time, on the temperance reform. What could you do as long as you had drinking ministers, elders, and deacons? The drunkards took shelter behind them, and you were obliged to drive the front rank from their post, before you could make any impression on the main body. It is so with slavery. Of all we can do here, nothing will be felt so much as the direct appeal to the slaveholding professing Christian. Now the slaveholder is welcomed to our pulpits and our Communion Table. Stop this—kindly, in a mild and christian spirit—but stop it. There is no test like this. Other measures

may reach the interest of the slave master, may touch his *feet*, but this touches his *head* and his *heart*. Yes, he has entrenched himself in the Church, and there he stands and means to stand, till slavery is driven out from the churches. Sir, I have described things as they are. They may seem different in the eyes of men, but how do they appear in the sight of an impartial, heart-searching God?

MR. BOURNE, of New York, seconded the resolutions. We were called fanatics. Was it fanaticism to prevent corruption creeping into the churches? He said we had a specimen of the perversion of the plainest precepts of Christianity, growing out of slavery, in the decision of the Savannah Baptist Association, that slaves who had lived as husband and wife, and were sold apart might marry again. The very question put to that association, began with a lie; for slaves cannot *marry* at all. The law forbids it. The Baptist Association knew there was no marriage in the case, either before or after the separation. The whole proceeding, therefore, was a mere sanction of fornication by the Church, among the slaves, for the benefit of their masters. Take an instance of the purity of the Church in this matter. A slave was sold, and separated from a woman with whom he had lived as his wife. He connected himself with another woman at his new place, and afterwards was carried back, with the woman, to the place he first left, and there he lived with both the women as his wives. He was a church member, and though the Church tolerated his living with one woman at a time, without marriage, and changing as often as he should be sold, it was thought a scandal that he should have two at a time. They took him to task, and finally decided, that he might take his choice between the two! This decision is on record, and this they call religion. I call it diabolism. Mr. Bourne related some other instances of the effect of slavery on the churches.

He said, he knew a Baptist church where they would not hear slaveholders preach, or have them commune. At one of the communions, a slaveholder was about to unite with them. The deacon went up to him, and said, you are a slaveholder. Yes. Then you cannot come to the Table of the Lord, till you are reconciled with your brother, whom you treat as a slave. The man insisted that he would come to the Table. You had better go out quietly, or I shall tell the minister, brother Williams, and in true Welsh style, he will read you out.

Go, sir, and cleanse the Church from the sin of slavery. Let the man-stealer no longer take possession of the pulpit. If this is not done, the Church will be the strong hold of slavery. The Methodist Conference in Cincinnati, have voted, ten to one, that the whole system of abolition and anti-slavery is wrong, that slavery is right, and they have condemned two brethren for attending an abolition meeting. Can this be tolerated, and Christianity long remain in the churches?

REV. MR. KINGSBURY, Editor of the *Zion's Herald*, here read the vote

of the Methodist Conference, censuring Rev. George Storrs, and Samuel Norris, for attending an abolition meeting. Mr. Kingsbury said—This was the act of Methodists, and he was a Methodist. His reply to his brethren in Cincinnati was, that when the Pope excommunicated Luther, Luther excommunicated the Pope. The Conference at Cincinnati have excommunicated us here, and we excommunicate the Conference.

MR. H. B. STANTON said—That most of the members of the Chillicothe Presbytery, who passed these resolves, were once slaveholders. Among them was James Gilleland, from North Carolina, who there refused to hold a slave. He was called the father of the Presbyterian church in Ohio. John Rankin, another, was from Virginia, raised in Kentucky. His soul was drawn out for the slave, but he found it impossible to do any thing, on account of the sanction the Church gave to slavery. Rev. William Dickey is another, who gave the horrible account of the slave who was cut up by piece meal, and burnt by an enraged master. [Mr. Stanton gave the names of several others, which escaped the Reporter.] These, he said, are the men who come from the South, who have seen and tested slavery, and who hold up to us our duty at the North. They say practically, that the Church at the South can do nothing to purify itself of the sin of slavery, until the Church at the North treats the slaveholder as a sinner; until it refuses to listen to the minister who sells and buys God's image. This is the Macedonian cry to us from the South: for these resolutions are the same in fact, as if they came from a Southern Presbytery. Shall we not listen to the cry, come and help us! Shall we not respond to the resolutions of the Chillicothe Presbytery?

MR. CAPLES, of Boston, spoke to that part of the resolutions relative to excluding colored Christians from the Communion Table. None, he said, could so well speak of the bitterness of slavery, as the man who had had his wife and children torn from his arms; and none could feel the effects of prejudice like one who had suffered from them. As a man of color, he knew what his brethren felt and suffered for this cause. Not long ago, a man, not blacker than myself, (Mr. Caples is a very light mulatto) hired a pew in a church in this city, and always paid his rent before it was called for. He never introduced into his pew persons blacker than himself, and always conducted with propriety. He went into the country, and gave up his pew. On his return, he applied to hire the pew again or another, and was told to wait until Saturday. He applied again, and was put off till the following Saturday. In the mean time, he received a note, which was sent to him by those who managed the church, saying, he could not have a pew in the church. He was thus driven from the house of God for his color.

My heart has bled at it, sir, when I have looked at the churches and seen the hardness and exclusiveness there towards my brethren. We

look to the Church of God to be like God—no respecter of persons. We say, if there is a spot of rest for us, it should be America; if a sanctuary on earth, it should be the Church in America, and how are colored Christians admitted there to worship, if at all? There are places built like pigeon holes, where lawyers stick their old executions in, and there the colored people may go. The sexton, if he even suspects that there is a drop of colored blood in the veins of any one who applies for a seat, will require a certificate before he will admit you.

I am pained when I think of the condition of the colored men; how they are kept down from showing whether they could rise if they had the opportunity. My blood is as warm as that of yours, sir, or that of any patriot; and when I see the embarrassments under which my brethren labor, the finger of scorn pointed at them, and the curled lip, my soul weeps. When I see the children of color, lisping the alphabet of profanity, denied the moral and religious influences that guide and guard the white children, my heart can be but grieved. When I contemplate them, and think how they are cut off from the advantages of life, I think there may be some soul there with the highest attributes of man, a mind, perhaps, that, if trained like other minds, might lead to great things. Some Cincinnatus, capable of influencing the destinies of a nation, some Hampden to inspire patriotism, some Milton, pregnant with celestial fire.

But what means, or what encouragement has the colored man to educate his son? If he succeeds in getting him as well educated as the favored sons of the whites, what can he do? If he sends him to the army, he cannot be received. Though he could combine the skill of a Wellington, the clemency of a Cæsar, and the courage of a Napoleon, he cannot succeed, he is a colored man. Suppose he is qualified for the bar. Though he spoke with the eloquence of Tully, the learning of Coke, and the wisdom of Fletcher, he cannot rise, he is a colored man. Go where he will to distinguish himself, he is met with rebuke, and driven back, because he is a colored man. It is his misfortune, and prejudice makes it a crime. No, sir, I will not say it is a misfortune. It is a Providence of God, and if there is a drop of blood I love, that flows in these veins, it is colored blood. (Applause.) What built up Athens? What extended Rome? The learning and the arts which came from colored men. Who built the Pyramids? Colored men. Who humbled Rome itself? Hannibal, a colored man.

Almost every college door is closed against us. At every step we meet a foe. If we could boast of minds as high as intellect can reach, we cannot cultivate them. There is not a race of men on the earth placed as the colored race is, that would not be degraded. I am aware that I am digressing, but it is the last time I shall occupy the floor. The colleges are shut against us. I rejoice to hear that there is one open to us, the Oneida Institute. The college at Middletown, Conn., excluded colored students. It is said, that Dr. Fiske, the President of that college, just before he went to England, had that removed. He could not go to



England with that yoke on his neck. He was going there to take collections, and he knew that he would have poor picking in England if it was known he would not admit a colored student to his college. I think the doctor had that yoke taken off, that he might safely graze under the British fence. (Applause.) It might do in Middletown, but to go to England and tell them he wanted their money, but would not suffer a colored man to be educated, the doctor would have found himself like a whale between a swordfish and a thrasher. When he comes back, I suppose the old vote will again be put into effect.

Sir, is all done that ought to be done by abolitionists? There are 530 abolition societies, and yet there are not 100 colored persons who have trades. Abolitionists have done much, but I have thought (may I be pardoned) they have not done as much as they could to procure places for colored men to learn trades, and prove that they are not an inferior race. Thousands would be glad to go into mechanics' shops, and to be hired as clerks. If places could be provided for 500 young men to learn trades, how much benefit could be done by it. Sir, I am not complaining. I feel to thank God, to thank the men like those I see here, for what has been done for my race, and what is doing for us. Sir, I feel that you are the true patriots, that slavery or my country must be destroyed. Let us say, that slavery shall be destroyed, and let us not have to say *delenda est Carthago*.

REV. T. S. WRIGHT, of New York, said—It gave him pleasure to inform his friend, that the American Anti-Slavery Society had taken efficient means to give trades to the colored people.

MR. H. B. STANTON. These resolutions should we well looked to before we adopt them. They will make sad havoc in the churches. There are numbers of ministers here. Do they mean to carry out these resolutions? In most of their churches they have got little pens built up for the colored Christians, apart from the rest. Why is this done? If it were a matter of indifference, we should let the colored man set where he pleased, or give him a seat, as James the Apostle has laid down the rule. Sir, I am not for dividing God's family in the house of God, into classes and pens. The seats for the blacks are not set apart and marked NEGRO'S SEAT, as a mark of honor, but of contempt. Now, we are commanded to esteem all men, and especially the brethren, according to their moral and religious character. Why should the color make an exception to the rule? Some say, we must regard men according to their intellect, and not according to their moral character. Why, sir, the devil has more intellect than the whole of this assembly. Treat men, then, according to their moral character. Why, then, do you set apart the colored man, as if he were a felon to be shunned. O! they say, it is the custom, the state of feeling, and it can't be helped. Who makes the custom? who fosters the feeling? Go to the minister, he tells you

he cares nothing about it—the deacon says, he cares nothing about it, the church members, individually, care nothing about it, but, *all together*, they care just enough about it to keep up the exclusion in the churches. Where, I ask, is the responsibility in this matter? I want individual responsibility. Where is it? Do *you* care nothing about it? Then show it by breaking down this exclusiveness in your own church. No, sir, it is prejudice that stands in the way, that shuts up your shops, your desks, and your churches to the colored man. You will not let the colored man learn the use of language, and then say, he has no eloquence. You tie his hands, and then reproach him, that he has no skill to work; you bore out his eyes, and affirm he cannot see. It is prejudice that does this: wicked prejudice that taints the air we breathe.

Now, sir, this feeling is wrong. If you see a colored man in this depressed situation, the law of love commands you to go and lift him up when bowed down. The Saviour, when he described the wounded man, did not tell us to inquire whether he was noble or mean, but to help him. We, sir, are the robbers of the black man—he has fallen among thieves, and the Priest and the Levite are passing by on the other side. Say nothing of stages and steamboats—they violate God's Law on the Sabbath. Let them expel the black man if they will, but let us look to the house of God. As long as we pen up the colored Christians, as if ashamed to worship God with them, we authorise the stages and steamboats to drive them out. Let the work begin in God's sanctuary. These resolutions are strong meat, and we should be prepared for it. We must not only resolve, but we must practice. A new church has been recently erected in New York, and there the colored Christians are set off in a pen. What right have we to complain of stages and steamboats? We take the prejudice which excludes the colored man there, and bring it up to the sacred font, and baptize it holy, just as slavery itself is baptized by the Church and made holy.

Now, sir, in opposing this unholy prejudice we must act prudently. We must not thrust forward our colored brethren, and leave them to be destroyed by it. But you and I, of paler skins, must step right out and take the hail storm as it comes. (Applause.) We must hold the shield over their heads, and take the shafts ourselves. Sir, I heard the call for the question before I rose, but before the question was taken, I wanted to be sure that the ministers understood it.

MR. TAYLOR, of Virginia, said—That none could realise the force of these resolutions who had not set under a slaveholding minister. He had, till his heart ached. He never heard a slaveholding minister come out against the sin of licentiousness among the slaves. He dare not do it. Mr. Taylor said, that the strongest argument for slavery at the South, was the treatment of the colored people at the North. Their degraded and despised condition here, was used as a strong reason for keeping them in slavery, because they were better off. I have often been told, said

Mr. Taylor, that even abolitionists did not like to have the colored people take part in their meetings, and come on their platforms. But I thank God, if ever I can plead the cause of the slave in Virginia again, I shall be able to say, that here I took my colored brother by the hand on the platform, and hailed him as a brother indeed. [Mr. Taylor accompanied this remark, with taking the hand of Rev. Theodore S. Wright, of New York, who sat near him.]

REV. MR. THACHER—Supported the resolutions, by showing from the precepts of St. James, that the Christian ought not to be a respecter of persons, and reject the poor and humble, while they exalted others to the highest seats. I agree with the Apostle James, said Mr. Thacher, and if he were here he would go with his whole heart and soul for these resolutions. The Pharisees were rebuked for saying to men of their own color, ‘Stand thou apart, I am holier than thou;’ but we set the colored Christian aside, not because we are holier, but because we are *whiter*.

Is not a colored man a man? We see our brother there (Mr. Wright)—does he not look like a man? Does he not speak like a man? We heard him pray. Did he not pray, I will not say like a man, but like a Christian? Did Philip refuse to commune with the Eunuch because he was a black man? Did he tell him not to approach the Communion Table, but to wait until others were first served? No. He was not ashamed to ride in the same chariot with the Ethiopian: nor would he have been ashamed to sit in the same *pew*, and at the same *table* with him.

REV. MR. FIRCH, of Boston, briefly supported the resolutions. He said they were called strong meat, but in his estimation, they were the sincere milk of the word.

MR. WOODBURY, of Acton. The resolutions address themselves directly to Christians. There are some of all denominations here, and now, brethren beloved, the gist and marrow of the matter is, that this sin of slavery in the churches, is not that Christians sell men only, but they sell Christians; they sell men who are identified with Christ. If the Bible is true, they barter the body of Christ for gain; for, if they sell Christians, they might as well sell Christ. In the Christian slave, we must not merely see the form of a man, but the face of Christ.

REV. T. S. WRIGHT. The professing Christian of the regular churches may see that others are more liberal than they to the people of color. The Society of Shaking Quakers know no distinction of color. The infidels at Tammany Hall in New York, do the same, and some of my colored brethren go there on that account. The Roman Catholics in the West and the South do the same. They treat the colored man as a brother.

MR. CHARLES STUART, related a historical fact to show the noble magnanimity with which the colored man could act. In the time of the French Republic the government of St. Domingo was administered by Toussaint, then at war with the English, who were trying to reduce the Island. An English officer, named Rainsford, driven on the Haytian coast by stress of weather, was seized and brought before the tribunals as a spy. A court martial was held, at which Gen. Christophe, afterwards king, was present. The proceedings were fair, according to the rules of war; and the decision was, that Lieut. Rainsford was a spy, and he was therefore condemned to die. Toussaint was absent, and the decision was sent to him for his approval. Several days elapsed. Lieut. Rainsford was thrown into a dungeon, waiting death. How did these people behave? The black ladies came to the prisoner, in pity, with their fruits and sweetmeats, and all the kind hospitalities, which ladies every where know best how to administer. And what was Toussaint's decision? 'I approve of the sentence,' said he, 'but why should we execute the stranger? He is helpless and alone. Let us have compassion on his mother, and not break her heart. Send him back to England, and tell him to tell the English what we are, and advise them to come here no more to bring back slavery upon us.' This, sir, was the act of a great man, of a great heart: and for this I acknowledge the colored man, *is a MAN AND A BROTHER.*

SAMUEL E. SEWALL, Esq., wished to say a word, in explanation of the vote he should give in the negative. With the spirit of the resolutions he heartily agreed. His only reason for voting against them was, because he entertained doubts whether any body of Christians had a right to exclude a man from the Communion Table at all.

The question on the passage of the resolution was then put, and carried with the single vote of Mr. Sewall in the negative.

REV. MR. MAY requested leave to assign his reasons for not voting at all. He had the same scruples as those entertained by his friend, Mr. Sewall, but he would not oppose the resolutions, because he thought it the duty of Christians, who believe in the propriety of this discipline in the Church, to vote for them.

The subsequent resolutions were adopted without discussion:—

On motion of H. B. STANTON:—

*Resolved,* That the sympathy manifested, in this country, towards the Texans, instead of showing our love for liberty, is clearly and most manifestly indicative of the pro-slavery spirit of the people of these United States, and ought to be turned into the strongest moral reprobation.

On motion of C. C. BURLEIGH:—

*Resolved,* That the recent arrest of Rev. George Storrs, of New Hampshire, while engaged in a solemn act of worship; and his subsequent trial, conviction as 'a

common railer and brawler,' and a sentence to imprisonment at hard labor in the house of correction, constitute an iniquitous perversion of law, and a base prostitution of the forms of judicial proceedings, involving the actors in the guilt of injustice, tyranny and perjury—and an infringement of religious liberty, which should rouse to reflection and action, every minister of the gospel of every denomination, every friend of any of the great causes of moral reform, every member of that profession and that body of the magistracy which have been grossly insulted by this caricature, at once ludicrous and wicked, and of every lover of civil and religious freedom.

*Resolved*, That the imprisonment of Dr. Reuben Crandall, in the district of Columbia, and the hardships to which he has been subjected, on the charge of being an abolitionist, are a violation of law and the constitution, which demand from the whole people without distinction of sect or party, a strong expression of indignant reprobation, and a requisition of reparation for his wrongs.

On motion of REV. S. J. MAY :—

*Resolved*, That we gratefully acknowledge our high obligations, under God, to the faithful women—the mothers and daughters of the land—who have from the first given to our holy cause, their fearless, unshinking co-operation and support, under circumstances that have tried men's souls.

*Resolved*, That we view with alarm and indignation the slightly opposed passage, in the Senate of the United States, of a Bill for the admission of Arkansas into our Union, with a clause providing for the perpetuity of slavery, thus removing beyond the reach of the influence, which may be exerted for their emancipation, through our members of Congress, thousands of our fellow-beings, who are now held in slavery within that territory, and consigning them to hopeless, remediless bondage.

On motion of THEODORE S. WRIGHT :—

*Resolved*, That this Convention regarding the Liberator as one of the most valuable and efficient instruments in carrying forward the cause of injurious liberty, cordially recommend it to the patronage of the friends of that cause.

On motion of R. P. WATERS :—

*Resolved*, That as citizens, as Christians, and as abolitionists, we cannot consistently contribute to give official power to men, who, like the Chief Priests and Rulers, when they commanded the Apostles 'to speak no more in this name,' command us to speak no more in the name of liberty, and universal emancipation.

On motion of S. J. MAY :—

*Resolved*, That Congress has constitutional authority to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

*Resolved*, That Congress has constitutional authority to abolish the slave trade between the States of this Union.

*Resolved*, That the people of the United States in tolerating a domestic slave trade, incur as deep a guilt as they would by tolerating the African slave trade.

*Resolved*, That all abolitionists and anti-slavery societies, encouraged by the success of the last year, should exert themselves with redoubled zeal to effect the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

*Resolved*, That, as the toleration of slavery is the crying sin of our nation, no abolitionist ought to vote for any candidate for Congress who is not known to be in favor of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia.

On motion of BENJAMIN GREEN, of BOSTON :—

*Resolved*, That the character of the opposition to the anti-slavery cause, clearly proves and happily illustrates the truth and righteousness of abolition principles.

On motion of MOSES THACHER :—

*Resolved*, That this Convention most cordially approve of the independent and patriotic course of a faithful few, conductors of periodical presses, who have ably defended the rights of *free discussion*, in opposition to the demands of tyrants and their obsequious apologists.

On motion of C. C. BURLEIGH :—

*Resolved*, That we hail with joy, the establishment in the city of New York, of an anti-slavery paper which well merits its title—Zion's Watchman, and not the less that the profits arising from its publication, are to be appropriated to the education of the colored people—and that we recommend it to the patronage of the friends of truth and freedom.

On motion of BENJAMIN KINGSBURY :—

*Resolved*, That the proceedings of the Convention be published under the direction of the Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

On motion S. J. May :—

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention be officially presented to the proprietors of this Church, for their Christian liberality in granting to us the use of it for the accommodation of this body.

On motion of J. S. KIMBALL :—

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention be officially presented to the Choir.

On motion of R. P. WATERS :—

*Resolved*, That the thanks of the Convention be presented to its President, for the attentive, impartial and courteous manner in which he has presided over its deliberations.

The Convention having united in prayer, and sung a hymn, was dissolved at *half past six*, having been in session for three days.



