THE EXAMINER.

J. C. VAUGHAN, Editor.
F. COSBY, Assistant Editor.

LOUISVILLE::::::::::MAY 20, 1848.

The Rev. James Freeman Clarke had relinquished the editorial charge of the Christian World. He says—"To edit a paper properly, requires all the time and thoughts of at least one man." To this every editor of a paper will respond Amen.

Anniversary Week.

The various Religious and Philanthropic Societies of the country, met last week in New York City, and had, doubtless, a profitable and joyous time of it.

It is amusing to look over the reports, and see how adverse some of them are to each other.

Here in one building, one says, "we are in the right, and know it, and mean to stand by it." Then, across the way, a truly strong minded speaker "denounces his neighbor, and all his neighbor's doings, as leading to sin, misery, and ruin." Fortunate is it for us, that we have such freedom of speech! More fortunate for us still, that Providence works out results from our contradictions, and oppositions, so beneficial to all!

We cannot, of course, give anything like a full report of the proceedings of the various Societies. No paper pretends to do that. But we will do the next best thing—offer in our next a synopsis of most of them. Our readers will then get a bird's eye view of what is going on in the world. Happy will it be if it shall stimulate them to renewed efforts in the cause of human happiness and progress.

Violence.

Nothing is gained by violence. As a matter of policy, it is the worst thing men or parties can resort to. History shows, and individual experience attests, that violence invariably produces a reaction against those who resort to it, and as invariably retards the progress of truth, if its defenders are guilty of this excess.

We have watched the effect produced upon the country by the ultra action of certain Senators on the slavery question in the debate we have published. In the free States, every press condemns! In the slave, not a voice approves that we have heard! The Democratic Review for May—an able organ of a great party—thus speaks of the conduct of its own friends:—

"We mourn over the weakness of human reason, when we see a man like Mr. Calhoun, of advanced age, long experience, and towering intellect, give himself up, in the face of his country and the world, to all the childish excesses of unbridled passion. It is just this defect of his character that has destroyed his career; which has made him unserviceable to his country, an injury to his party, and useless to his age. How is it possible to respect a man who forgets himself, and the body he should adorn, by conduct and words we could only expect in a maniac or a common driveller. The question of slavery is the rock on which Mr. Calhoun has constantly split, instead of being, as with a statesman of any address or real patriotism it would have been, a stepping stone to the highest fame and loftiest preferment.

"We shall not waste a word on the disgusting rant of Foote, of Mississippi, who proclaimed his ferocious aspirations after a hangman's job, whose functions he is evidently better fitted to perform than those of a Senator. We protest, in the name of the honorable body to which he belongs, of the noble State whose dignity he has lowered, and of our common country, which he disgraces, against language and sentiments which the most abandoned leader of a street mob would hesitate in this country to utter, but which this senseless demagogue hoped would procure him notoriety. We are sure that Mr. Calhoun must blush to be found for a moment in such company."

A Practical View.

The Rev. Mr. King fell heir to fourteen slaves in Louisiana, and, after some years debate with himself, concluded that he had no right to hold them as such.

His next step was to free them. For this purpose he visited the free States, and Canada; the latter, he selected for their home. On his way thither he tarried in Cincinnati, and while there a meeting was called at the Rev. Dr. Rice's church to hear his "experience." We quote a part of it:

I acknowledge the social and moral evils of slavery. It was easy to prove that. But it was not so easy in a spiritual sense to say what could be done. The gospel must be left free.

I acknowledge that slavery has more attendant evils than any I know unconnected with the system—no language could depict them.—But what could the Church do? She had to "preach the gospel." This duty she was now actively engaged in discharging, and although she was not going on as fast as we might wish, our duty was simply to encourage her as far as she went.

In taking his freed men and women to Canada, he meant no disparagement to the colonization scheme. He took them there, because he had been there and seen for himself that many liberated, and among them some *self-liberated*, slaves were doing well there; and because there only he had opportunities of providing for, and educating them. When instructed to choose for themselves, they could, if they preferred, go back to *their own country*. The free colony of Liberia was doing more for the abolition of the slave trade than all the fleets of England, France and America; and the day when Ethiopia should stretch forth her hands to God, would, he humbly believed, be brought about through the instrumentality of the descendants of Africa.

Dr. Rice, well known in Kentucky, and an eminent divine of the Presbyterian Church, followed Mr. King. He felt no sensitiveness as to the discussion of slavery. Let it be free! As free in the South as in Cincinnati. He would do as much almost as any man for the removal of slavery. He would not denounce or excommunicate slaveholders. The evil was almost as great to them as to the slave. The gospel had freed the slave in the East; the same result would follow in the South. Having enlarged on this point, he said:

It was not for the Presbyterian church to abolish slavery. That was for the people to do, and they could not be driven to do it. The question was precisely like that of coffee-house licensing in his city. We would not go and tear down those excrescences, while our own representative had the power to shut them up and did not use it. We would continue to throw light upon the subject by freely discussing it, till we changed their minds or changed them.—It was hard, he confessed, for men to *see light through a dollar*, and still harder to act according to that light. We wanted more light upon the subject of slavery even here in Ohio, where people still feared having too many of the colored race come among them.

He had never entertained any of these common prejudices on the subject, even while living in a slaveholding State. He did not anticipate the dangers or admit the difficulties commonly believed to be involved in emancipation. The thing would not be difficult [we understood the speaker to assert] if only public opinion were in favor of it, instead of being opposed.

As the Presbyterian Church he scarcely knew of any, certainly he did not know *three pro-slavery men!* But all that the church could do, as such, was—"to preach the gospel." That would bring about emancipation, and nothing else ever would.

We suppose we must make due allowance for these reports of speeches. They are often hurried; sometimes inaccurate. Still, we conclude the main idea entertained by both the Rev. Speakers is fairly stated. Let us dwell for a moment upon it.

"What can the Presbyterian Church do?" Says Dr. Rice, she cannot abolish slavery.—True, as regards the mere *legal* act. But she can help that job; nay, if she were united, if her members as citizens, at the ballot box, and christians in the Church, should say, "let us emancipate, it is no longer burden ourselves, or oppress the black, let it be free," she would carry the question triumphantly. The power of the gospel to do, and undo, we fully admit. It can be preached no where with fidelity—lived out in no land with purity—without eventually filling the minds of those who hear, or see it practised, with its living, eternal truth. If every minister in Kentucky were this week to start with a full determination to act openly, heartily, against slavery, if every christian should do the same, no man can doubt the result. Kentucky would be declared free in three years!

"But all that the Church could do, as such," add both speakers, "is to preach the gospel." Is this correct? The gospel may be preached, and not a word be said *against* slavery. Nay, worse yet, it may be proclaimed Sabbath after Sabbath, and the institution *defended*. But we are sure neither of the distinguished divines referred to such preaching as this! They spoke of, they meant to refer to, the Gospel as taught in its true spirit. Still, with this understanding, we think the position erroneous; liable to serious misconstructions; wrong, if understood literally. We will show this, or attempt to do so, by dwelling at present on these points.

1 *Among slaves, parents and children, husbands and wives, by law, can be torn asunder as whim, caprice, passion, or necessity may dictate.*

Of this terrible feature of slavery, nothing need be said. It stands out in naked horror, desolating in its iniquity, and cannot be justified. Now has the Church, as such, no power over this revolting part of the institution? That cannot be said. Is that power exerted? It meets in the States annually—it meets in the Union regularly—and when thus assembled it could appeal to its members earnestly, at every session, to the legislatures of the States in which they reside—to labor together in forbidding so monstrous a wrong. Would such an appeal fall powerless upon "its own?" This is out of the question. They would heed it. As to that, it might be made a matter of Church law, that no member should sell a human being for money, or under any circumstances, which he could control, separate families. Could this appeal be powerless with the Legislature? We think not. A body so strong, so learned, so influential speaking thus, would command its respect and force it, by other christian aid, to do what is right on this weighty point. We ask again has this been done? Has it been earnestly, year in and year out persevered in, by the Church? If not, it could do something more than preach; it could carry out what was preached.

2. *Marriage of Slaves.*

There is no such thing as legal marriage among them. True, many good men, and good ministers, do all in their power to remedy this evil. But they cannot begin to reach it. The law is too strong for them. Interest, passion, self-indulgence, is too strong for them. Now has the Church, *as such*, declared that its members must do all in their power to legalize marriages among slaves, and concentrate its influence against the law? The evil is confessed. It breeds licentiousness in every quarter. Not alone among blacks, but among all classes! And there is not a parent, living where slaves are numerous, and who has the means, who does not say to himself, "to avoid this evil, and its consequences, to give my boys steady habits, I will send them into a free State, and there let them be taught." Well, the Legislature could change this feature of slavery, and if the public demanded it, it would do so. And has not the Church, as such, control over that public? Are not its members among its most influential citizens? Again we ask, could it not influence—if zealous, if in earnest, if fired with a determination to do and demand the right, could it not *compel* a reluctant legislature to alter the law, and make it conform to Christianity and justice? Show us twenty men who doubt this. Show us *one* who denies it. Give us this hour a compact, hearty union in the Church, as such, and, out of it, among its members—let us hear the former in solemn conversation, say in behalf of Eternal truth, "these things must not be," and the latter from the pulpit, and in public, and private, everywhere, protest steadily, vehemently against them, and *they will not be!* Where is this union? Who hears these protests?

3. *Traffic in Slaves.*

Who can defend that? Who can palliate it? The great public of Kentucky does not. Last winter, in the Legislature, there was not a man, no matter how ultra on the subject of slavery, who pretended to do it. Traffickers in human flesh for gain stand condemned in the minds of all men, and there is no sympathy for them. Now suppose next winter, as the Legislature assembled, the great and good of the Church should meet them, and in plain, but temperate speech, protest against this wrong, and point out its injury to the State—its hurt to morals—its bitter injustice—and say, "thus does the Church, as such, and thus do its members, as citizens, believe, and, therefore, they pray the legislators of Kentucky, to stop forever so infamous a trade" would they resist the appeal? From every class—from all neighborhoods in every county—from the whole State—the voice of the people would second this demand, and immediately—as if by common consent—this glorious reform would be accomplished! Has this been done? Has anything like it been attempted?

Now, our purpose in these remarks, is not to find fault with Dr. Rice. We believe he says what he means, when he declares he would do all he could to remove slavery. Nor yet to censure the Church. That is not our way of acting. No, we have made these plain statements of our views, simply to rouse, as far as we can, the genial nature and generous spirit of Dr. Rice to a new and broader endeavor in behalf of freedom, and to persuade the Church—and its members, not rashly, but with calm resolution, and in a loving, trusting spirit—to exert their power directly, heartily, for the correction of the wrongs we have detailed, for their own sake, for the sake of Christianity, for the good of all men!

A Demonstration.

Not anti-Republican, but anti-Whitney! Not anti-Internal Improvement, but anti the Pacific Rail-road!

A proposition is made, as our readers know, to grant Mr. Whitney one hundred million acres of land to build a rail-road from some point on the Mississippi to the Pacific. The Cincinnatians met last week and protested against it.—They petitioned Congress to refuse the proposition—to deny any man the "mighty monopoly" which Mr. Whitney asked.

The meeting was a very large one, and passed the following resolutions unanimously:

1. *Resolved*, That we view with feelings of exultation and pride the progress of our country in works of internal improvement, and are ready to approve just and proper schemes for the extension of State and National Rail-roads, wherever the public interest requires their construction.

2. *Resolved*, That we regard the proposed grant to Asa Whitney, of 100,000,000 acres, as wrong in principle, and as tending to foster an odious system of monopoly and speculation, stock-jobbing and gambling, equally adverse to sound policy, to public virtue, and to the rights of the American people.

3. *Resolved*, That we regard our national domain as sacred to the use and benefit of the people, and that it should be so managed as to give to every industrious citizen the amplest opportunity of securing a home for himself and his family, at the smallest possible expense.

4. *Resolved*, That it should be the aim of Congress, as guardians of the People's rights, so far as practicable, to prevent the public domain from falling into the hands of speculators and monopolists, to the prejudice of the settler, and that we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to resist strenuously the proposed grant to Mr. Whitney, or any other scheme tending to transfer the public lands into the possession of land speculators or corporations; or any attempt to force these lands into a premature market of speculation in advance of their actual settlement.

5. *Resolved*, That in the struggle between capital and labor, it has been the general tendency of labor to sink in the unequal contest by the depreciation of wages, and that we object to any legislative action tending to foster capital monopoly and speculation, without regard to the welfare and elevation of the laboring population, upon whose condition the safety and prosperity of our republic mainly depend.

6. *Resolved*, That the experience of this country in the way of anti-rent agitation, proves that large land monopolies are dangerous to the peace of the country, and will not be submitted to by the people, unless supported by a standing army.

7. *Resolved*, That while monarchy and aristocracy are sinking in Europe, before the intelligence of the People, it is not the proper time to lay the foundation of a landed aristocracy in America by surrendering the People's rights in the soil, and that we now, in behalf of *thirty millions of freemen*, who will hereafter inhabit the proposed grant, protest against the sacrifice of their rights by surrendering the land to private monopoly.

It was resolved that the proceedings of the meeting be signed by the officers, published in papers of the city, and forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Many speeches were made on this occasion. We copy a synopsis of Mr. S. Lewis' speech to show the spirit of the speaker and the meeting:

Mr. Lewis was then called on, and spoke in support of the resolutions with great effect. His views of the *humanitary* duty as well as true *republican* policy of the government of this country met with universal appreciation. He called to mind Randolph's withering denunciation of the famous or infamous Yazoo claims, and pointed as a caution to the present results of the Van Rensselaer claims in New York. The bad effects of having land held in large tracts was proven by the practical experience of the whole country. Supposing—if we could suppose such an absurdity!—the Government to be the great Father of the people under its protection, its children by birth or adoption, it should, on American principles, divide out the family estate equitably, and set up each child, who wished it, on a little farm of his own. (Hearty applause.) He was a *Native American?*—by birth, not in principle, so called—his ancestors for 200 years had been native born—yet nothing rejoiced him more than that the millions were coming hither to become American too, and to beget Native Americans. He ridiculed the fashion of estimating the prosperity of a people, solely by its canals, railroads, &c., &c. He judged of it by all that "made man, man." Secure a prosperous, manly people, and they could make canals and rail-roads for themselves. (Applause.) Better let the government make it, leaving the land free, than throw away such sums in Mexican wars. (Great applause.)

The Corn Law Rhymer.

Ebenezer Elliot hates irresolution, and scorns all doubters. "Wait, France will fall" say the knowing ones. He holds no terms with such talk or talkers. "Give the straggler your cheer; shout hurra till he can hear you; brace him up when he is worn out; rouse him as he despends; let him know your heart is his, and he will be a man—will say and do great things—will master accidents, mistakes, and make order, right, supreme." This is his glorious creed. And for its adoption—for its universal application—he labors heartily. Listen to his song on the Third French Revolution:

Cold sneerers, dead to pity, lost to shame!
It came, it cometh, "the tremendous gloom,"
That buried the sire—dethroner to his doom:
God whispers—hark! he names "The dreaded Name
Of Demogorgon!" * Still your wolfish laws,
Base chain'd Prometheus to your vulture claws;
And hope ye to escape the torturer's fate?
Though long delay'd, it cometh, as it came;
It cometh! and will find you "taught too late"
Soul chaining, chain'd in soul, repentant never,
Darkest, yet darkening. Then, the fated frown
Will cast ye deep beneath all darkness down;
And brightened by your infamous renown
All other infamy look bright forever.

* See Shelley's Prometheus unbound.

Mobs.

A startling case of violence occurred in Mobile not long ago.

A member of the Legislature, an aged citizen of the interior, advocated the passage of laws which the people of Mobile thought would injure their city. He came there soon after on a visit. A crowd gathered round him—hooted and hissed—and made demonstrations of violence which induced many citizens to believe that violence might be committed upon his person. This, however, was not done.

His daughter—a sensitive girl—saw and heard the whole affair. What influence it had upon her, God only knows! But soon after she plunged into the river and found there a watery grave.—What man among that crowd who must not lament his violence? Who of them so brutish as not to sorrow over its effects? Oh! how little we know on earth of kindness—of sympathy for error—of that loving faith which would buoy up the weak, and help on the sinning! Never yet did this spirit fail to do its holy mission. Never yet has violence or vindictiveness done aught but harm.

The New Orleans Delta, lamenting the result of the outbreak upon one so fair and lovely, remarks:—

But upon one point there can be no doubt or mystery, and that is as to the deep and damning disgrace of those who could so outrage the laws of hospitality and decency as to subject grey-haired age and the tender sensibilities of woman to the insult and mortification of a public display of popular prejudice and contumely.—There is nothing so thoroughly contemptible and disgusting as these mobocratical demonstrations. In this country of law and order, where all public agents are made responsible to the people for their acts, these practices of manifesting by brutal indignities disapproval of the conduct of public officers ought to be regarded as the most criminal violations of law and order, and outrages against the public peace. Every man who participates in such demonstrations *is an enemy to the distinguishing principle of our institutions*, which jealous respect for law and a firm reliance upon its adequacy to satisfy all wrongs. If the people violate and disregard their own laws—*if they resort to other means of accomplishing their purposes than those provided in the political systems framed by themselves*—then has our Republican Government given way to the worst tyranny to which society can be subjected, that of lawless mobs.

This is true, and well put. Mobs can never be defended on any plea of necessity. They are the worst tyranny to which society can be subject.

Matters of History.

Most of us have supposed that the Provisional Government of France was established by accident. It seemed to be a sort of necessity which brought it into being, for it really had no authority on which to rest. It was not voted into being by the French Chambers, nor created by the French people. The fact, therefore, that it has maintained itself, is proof that it has been wisely administered, and justly directed at home and abroad. But the European correspondent of the National Intelligencer shows that the Provisional Government was the result, not of accident, but of premeditation—design. We copy his account of the affair:

"The Republican party existed no doubt long before it manifested itself on the subversion of royalty in February. The revolution was prepared. The list of the Provisional Government was ready when Thiers and Odilon Barrot were dreaming of constitutional opposition, and a mere change of Ministry, with a long administration and possession of power under the regency of the Duchess of Orleans. It is highly probable that these enlightened statesmen contemplated great ameliorations in the condition and institutions of France; but power was not to pass into their hands. There was a crafter party behind the scenes, who were wide awake to the chances of the moment. They had their lists prepared, their course marked out. Neither of the parties opposed to them knew of their movements. Nobody dreamed that Lamartine and Garnier Pagès had constructed a Provisional Government; the secret, though necessarily confided to a number of persons, was well kept. When Paris rose to demand the dismissal of M. Guizot, this party sought the expulsion of the King. When Thiers and Barrot offered terms from the barricades, the republicans demanded further concessions; and when, in the Chamber of Deputies, the accession of the Count de Paris and the regency of the Duchess of Orleans were about to be proclaimed, Ledru Rollin demanded and obtained a Provisional Government of his own naming. This Government was not balloted for; they were not appointed by the voice of the moment; there was nothing of *accident* in the affair. It was all the result of premeditation and design. Now, considering all things, this Provisional Government has done wonders; we have stated that it has committed great errors, but, we trust, not fatal ones.

"The star of Lamartine is yet in the ascendant, and it is now shining with greater brilliancy than ever. He has kept on his career with wonderful constancy and courage. He has not aimed to acquire personal popularity at the expense of principle, either at home or abroad. He has opposed the dangerous course of Ledru Rollin and his section of the Government, and has refused to listen to the demands of the Communists, and his replies to the Poles; the Germans, the Irish, and the Belgians, have been as disinterested and as noble, as sound public judgment, and high chivalric private honor could dictate. The constancy and high principle of Lamartine have so far carried him successfully forward; all the moderate men of the Provisional Government adhere to him. Even Marrast, the stern republican mayor of Paris, and others of his *caste* who stand half-way between the *bourgeoisie* and the people have rallied round Lamartine, and left the anarchists to depend upon the clubs and the professional revolutionists. These latter attempted to commence an *emeute* on Sunday, but the drum was beat by order of Lamartine, and two hundred thousand citizens' bayonets bristled at once along the line of the boulevards in defence of law and order. Paris was illuminated, the people rejoiced at the defeat of the design to displace Lamartine, Marrast, and Garnier Pagès, and substitute Blanqui, and Cabet, leaders of the Communists; to disarm the National Guard, displace the magistracy, and replace them with working men; and to remove all the principal officers of the army and appoint leaders of the Communist clubs. In lieu of this a decree has been issued to put down the Communists, to close their clubs, and to arrest their leaders.

Yucatan.

A late arrival at Boston brings later news from this ill fated land. The Indians were still pursuing their foes. Their cry is death to all except the red man. The account says:

Laguna was overrun with fugitives from Campeachy and all parts of the country, and many were obliged to dwell in tents and even in the open air. Men of substance from Campeachy were at Laguna endeavoring to find an asylum for their families. Among others an English doctor, who said that he was about to abandon property to the value of $40,000 or $50,000 in Campeachy. His indignation at the pusillanimity of the Yucateces, led him to say that he almost wished that the Indians would take the town. At the last accounts, the Indians were within one day's march of Campeachy, in vast numbers, and with no abatement of their design of a general massacre of their opponents. Their war cry was "Death to both black and white—man, woman and child; all, save the red man!" They claim to be 250,000 strong, and say that the country rightfully belongs to them and they will possess it, and insure possession by the massacre of all their opponents.

They will undoubtedly take the town unless assistance arrives from other quarters. An American bomb vessel from Campeachy had come to Laguna to refit, and return to Campeachy. Another bomb vessel was daily expected at Laguna, and also 1,000 American soldiers which Captain Spates says it was currently rumored were marching to the assistance of the inhabitants of Yucatan.

A Puzzler.

The Senate debate on the proposition to take possession of Yucatan is interesting, and we wish we had room for it.

One extract, we must give, and that is, the passage between Senators Clayton of Maryland and Davis of Mississippi:

Mr. Clayton.—Will the Honorable gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Davis.—Certainly.

Mr. Clayton.—Suppose there should be a negro insurrection in Cuba, and that from motives of humanity Great Britain should interfere and take military possession of that island, for which course we are about to make a precedent, would the Honorable Senator hesitate to go to war?

Mr. Davis.—Not a moment.

Mr. Clayton.—It is the answer that I expected.

Mr. Davis.—I have no confidence in the humanity of Great Britain, the great slave-trader of the world. If she should interfere, on any pretext, in the affairs of Cuba, in order to obtain a footing there, I would regard it as a proper occasion to interfere. Great Britain has already attempted, under a pretext of establishing an hospital on the island of Cuba, in connexion with her slave-ships, to build up a Gibraltar to overlook the Spanish Moro Castle; and if the Government of Cuba had yielded to that demand, the weak Court of Spain not denying it, I would have considered it as demanding the immediate interference of the United States. The very necessity of defending the United States requires that we should take whatever steps should be necessary always to secure the freedom of the great point of exit and entrance to a large portion of the American coast. But I understand the question of the Senator as making the interference of Great Britain in the affairs of Cuba as a parallel case with the present.

Mr. Clayton.—I put that case to show the Senator the effect of his own declaration.

Mr. Dais.—I saw the conclusion, and was prepared for it.

Mr. Clayton.—It is a foregone conclusion.

Mr. Davis was frank. He admitted the correctness of the principle at once. This is important. For we notice that many persons, influenced by kindly feeling, say, "let us release the Yucatanese—it will not do to have them murdered in cold blood." How then can he justify the interference? Hear him:

Mr. Davis.—Have were not at war with Mexico, under a war of castes had sprung up in Yucatan, in which we had no right as a belligerent Power to interfere, however I might have been pained in beholding the spectacle, I should have viewed it as I did in the case of Guatemala, in which the Indian race triumphed, and established, as I would remind the Senator, a better government than Guatemala ever had before. If such were the case at present, I would stand quietly by and let the people decide which race should rule them. But I place this case of Yucatan solely on the ground of the Mexican war. I have not yet seen any convincing proof that Great Britain has interfered. She has been asked to send some troops, and I believe has sent three companies of artillery.

Mr. Clayton.—Is there not an armistice now existing.

Mr. Davis.—That originally constituted a difficulty with me, which, by one best calculated to construe it has been removed and does not now interpose any obstacle to my action. I am not apprized at what date that armistice expires, but I think it will come to an end before we can possibly get troops to Yucatan. Again, that armistice points directly to the fact that no new posts are to be taken in Mexico, except on account of movements on the part of Mexico. Here is a movement the result of which we cannot determine. It is like the war of factions all over Mexico. It may be for the purpose of interfering with the progress of the American army in the conclusion of the treaty. Is the Senator, from Delaware, prepared to say it is not?

We cannot blow hot and cold. If our Government says "no interference on the part of Europe," it must not set the example by interfering itself.

The public debt of the city of New York, on the 5th instant, is officially stated to be $11,911,076. Nearly the whole of the debt has been incurred in introducing the Croton water into the city.

The New York Courier announces the following "extraordinary arrival at that port."

This morning, the brig *Walbanding*, Captain Higgins, arrived at this port from Marietta, Ohio, from which place she sailed on the 26th of March last. Her cargo of flour was shipped at Madison, Indiana, and descending the Mississippi, she arrived at New Orleans on the 5th of April.

An Impressive Picture.—The poet Wordsworth is said to be in a state of imbecility, sitting often in moody silence, with his gaze fixed on vacancy.

Blind Girl's Song.

The pupils of the Blind had their anniversary at New York, and one of them, Miss Frances J. Crosby, wrote a poem for the occasion. It is very simple and beautiful. The poetry is entitled "Music," and reads as follows:

There is music in Nature; the glad voice of Spring
Is echoed o'er mountain, through valley and glade;
And the bird as it soars on its delicate wing,
Pours a rich mellow cadence to streamlet and shade.

There is music in Flowers; the violet meek—
Unmolested perhaps by the thoughtless and gay,—
Humility brightens its beautiful cheek,
And softly it whispers, 'I'm passing away.'

There is music in Twilight; how pensive the sigh
That floats on the air as it melts into even,
And the tear that unconsciously bursts from the eye,
Is borne on its breast to the portals of Heaven.

There is music in Friendship; how sweet is its tone
To the grief-stricken heart, of an idol bereft—
When the buds it once nourished are blighted and strewn,
And nought but the wreck of their beauty is left.

It breathes o'er the string of the slumbering lute,
Untuned and neglected though long it hath been,
And the eyes that were languid, and the lips that were mute,
Give back their bright glance and their warm gushing strain.

There is music in Ocean; the billows that roll
And mingle their voice with the wind's fitful blast—
How mournful they break, like a dirge on the soul,
And wake the sad mem'ry of joys that are past.

And oh! when the hero lies bleeding and still,
On the field where his laurels of triumph were won,
There is music for him in the clarion shrill—
For it tells of the deeds which the fearless have done.

I love its soft murmurs; the wild mountain stream,
As it leaps from the rock and meanders away;
On, on, through the maze of the vine-clad ravine,
Till at length it is lost in the Ocean's dark spray.

There is music in Heaven; those mansions of light
Resound with their anthems, the souls of the blest—
Forever and ever in praise they unite;
No sorrow shall reach them, no care shall molest.

The friends we have borne to the grave's narrow cell,
Wept when we wept, and our pleasures would share—
Look down on us still from the Home where ye dwell,—
We shall know them; ah! yes, they will welcome us there.

New York, May, 1848.

Ecclesiastical Testimony.

We suppose there is no ecclesiastical body in our country, which has not within the last few years spoken out on the subject of slavery. The subject is discussed by them all. In some, opinions are expressed which will seem ultra to many of our readers; in others, milder views prevail; but in nearly all—we may say in all out of the South—slavery is declared inconsistent with Christianity. It may not be amiss to hear this testimony, in part, even though it grate harshly upon our ears.

The convention of Congregational Ministers of the State of Vermont in 1846, passed the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, 1, That this Convention still believes and maintains that the great system of American slavery is, in its fundamental principles, contrary to the spirit and the gospel of Christ, and utterly sinful before God; that the laws which support it are unrighteous and cruelly oppressive; that the tendency of the system is, and must be, to degrade, demoralize, and destroy the souls of the enslaved, and to bring divine condemnation and wrath on those who thus enslave and wrong them; to disturb continually the peace which should subsist between the different States of our Union, and thus put in fearful peril our national welfare; to introduce and foster discord in our religious connexions; and thus to drive from us the Spirit of God, and to hinder deplorably the progress of his kingdom both in this and in other lands; that these evils are not incidental, but inherent in the system, making it utterly incurable, and before both earth and heaven abominable; and for these reasons all men, especially all Christian men, ought to lift up a united voice of strong remonstrance against a system fraught with so much guilt and misery; and to do whatever they rightfully and judiciously can, to bring it to a speedy and final termination."

The General Association of Massachusetts affirm that the word of God is utterly opposed to slavery, and declare that no members of the church can consistently uphold it. It calls upon all christians to oppose it. "We would earnestly beseech all christians," says the Association, "connected with the system, in view of their profession, to be living examples of the gospel, and in the light of God's truth carefully to review their opinions and practice, and to do their utmost to free the church of Christ from the pollution of this guilt."

The General Conference of Maine, express themselves as follows:

"As we have heretofore expressed our solemn conviction that the system of Slavery existing in the United States is a great sin against God and man, and a most threatening evil, for which our nature ought to humble itself—and that the North, as well as the South, is deeply implicated in the guilt of slavery, and that for its speedy and entire removal every Christian ought to pray, and use all suitable means within his reach—we now re-affirm our abhorrence of the system, as being fraught with immense evil both to the oppressor and the oppressed.

"Believing it to be entirely contrary to the Word of God, so far as that Word obtains an ascendancy in the consciences and hearts of Christians, they must and will separate themselves from all responsible connexion with the system. We do affectionately and earnestly entreat all slaveholders who profess to be the disciples of Him who came to preach deliverance to the captives—in view of their profession, and in the light of God's Word, carefully and seriously to review their opinions and practice relating to this subject, and to do their utmost to free the church from the pollution of this guilt."

The General Association of New Hampshire consider the principle of slavery "inconsistent with natural justice, utterly at variance with the spirit and principles of the Bible, the fruitful source of wrong, suffering, and sin among men, of danger to our country, and a hindrance to the progress of the gospel."

One hundred and seventy Unitarian ministers (1845) uttered their solemn protest against American slaveholding—

"Because it is a violation of the law of Right, being the sum of all unrighteousness which man can do to man; depriving him not only of his possessions, but of himself. And as in the possession of one's self are included all other rights, he who makes a man a slave, commits the greatest possible robbery, and the greatest possible wrong.

"Because it violates the law of Love, which says, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.'

"Because it degrades man, the image of God, into a thing; changes persons into property; and, by violating the dignity of the human soul, is constant sacrilege against that soul which the Scriptures declare to be the temple of the Holy Ghost."

We could multiply this testimony, but we close with that of the Synod of Kentucky, borne in 1836. They affirm:

"It dooms thousands of human beings to hopeless ignorance." "It deprives its subjects in a great measure of the privileges of the gospel." "This system licenses and produces great cruelty." "Brutal stripes and all the varied kinds of personal indignities are not the only species of cruelty which slavery licenses. The law does not recognize the family relations of a slave, and extends to him no protection in the enjoyment of domestic endearments. The members of a slave family may be forcibly separated so that they shall never more meet until the final judgment. And rapacity often induces masters to practice what the law allows. Brothers and sisters, parents and children, husbands and wives, are torn asunder, and permitted to see each other no more. *These acts are daily occurring in the midst of us.* The shrieks and the agony often witnessed on such occasions proclaim, with a trumpet tongue, the iniquity and cruelty of our system. The cry of these sufferers goes up into the ears of the Lord of Sabbaoth. There is not a neighborhood where these scenes are not displayed. There is not a village or road that does not behold the sad procession of manacled outcasts, whose chains and mournful countenances tell that they are exiled by force from all that their hearts hold most dear. Our church, years ago, raised its voice of solemn warning against this flagrant violation of every principle of mercy, justice, and humanity. Yet we blush to announce to you that this warning has been often disregarded, *even by those who hold to our communion.* Cases have occurred in our own denomination, where professors of the religion of mercy have torn the mother from her children, and sent her into a merciless and returnless exile. *Yet acts of discipline have rarely followed such conduct.*"

Again they say:

"*It produces general licentiousness among the slaves.*" "*Their licentiousness is the necessary result of our system.*"

Nor do they shrink from adding this most melancholy confession:

"*Our familiarity with this consequence of slavery prevents us from regarding it with that horror which it would, under other circumstances, inspire.*"

They acknowledge that they shall never be able to keep themselves entirely pure even from the grossest pollutions of slavery, *until they are willing to pledge themselves to the destruction of the whole system.*

The Effects.

Stringent laws, like violent actions, recoil. It is bad when Courts dub a man traitor, while the people hail him as a patriot. Yet your tyrannous statutes breed men who would brave the halter, or the whetted knife, when they would not pander to vice, or fawn upon authority.

The Whig Ministry of England has resorted once again to laws which interdict free speech, free action, free remonstrance. The people keep quiet. The Free-trade league murmurs not. But those who started, and carried the anti-corn law league—they who lead that victorious band—Joseph Hume, Richard Cobden, &c., &c., met, some fifty members of parliament in all, and resolved:

"That it appears to this meeting, that a more cordial understanding and co-operation are urgently required among such members of Parliament as are favorable to the extension of the suffrage, an equitable arrangement of taxation, a reduction of expenditure, and the general advance of reform principles throughout Great Britain and Ireland; that Joseph Hume, M. P., be chairman; that Richard Cobden, M. P., be deputy chairman; that Sir Joshua Walmsley, M. P., be honorary secretary; and that the committee have power to add to their numbers."

This is a small matter seemingly. Yet next news will tell us of larger numbers in Parliament, joining the move—of hundreds of thousands seconding it out of parliament. It is anti-whig, anti-tory. It is for reform out and out. Says the Manchester Examiner:

"It must rejoice the hearts of all true reformers to find that so many of the large constituencies in the United Kingdom have thus virtually declared in favor of Parliamentary reform. Before many days we may expect to see a considerable accession to their numbers. Every large town in the kingdom will now watch the course taken by their representatives, who must either declare in favor of reform, or give in their adhesion to the Whig apostate Government.

We shall hear of this move by and by.

Court of Inquiry the United States.

We copy the following from the New Orleans Picayune of the 9th:

The Court of Inquiry.—The Court of Inquiry met at the St. Charles Hotel, in this city, yesterday morning, with closed doors, and adjourned until this morning, when various witnesses now in this city will be examined. We understand that the members of the court will leave the city on the 10th or 11th by the way of the river to hold a session in Frederick, Md., where they will adjourn about the 29th inst., unless something unexpected should turn up in the mean time.

The following is from the New Orleans Delta of the same date:

We were informed last evening by General Cushing, that the Court of Inquiry had not positively decided on its place of meeting in the United States. It would, in all probability, be at Washington, or some place very near there. They have to take the depositions of a number of persons in the United States; and there is no telling when the investigation will end, or how.

The members of the court, Generals Towson, and Cushing, and Col. Belknap, arrived here on Tuesday, on the steamboat Cincinnati from New Orleans. They remained but a few hours, and went up the river on the steamer Telegraph.

France.

The accounts of the disturbances in Paris, as detailed in the English papers, and copied into ours, are very much exaggerated. The communists, we suppose, intended to force the Provisional Government into the adoption of some of their schemes. But even this they deny. M. Cabet, their leader, affirms that they are not hostile to the Provisional Government, and that their conduct would have proved it.

The number of the communists is very much overstated. It is not large either in Paris or the Provinces—not large enough, certainly, to defy the central power, or overthrow it.

Then again they are confounded with the disciples of Fourier. These are very numerous, and have as leaders, some of the ablest men in Europe. It would be difficult to find the superior of *Victor Considerant*. Besides these doctrines differ wholly from Communism, and the followers of Fourier are the fast friends of order, of the Provisional Government, and especially of Lamartine.

It seems that the demonstrations of the Communists served this good purpose—to show the strength of the Provisional Government, and the determination of the people of Paris to sustain it. Not a man of the civic or national guard hesitated in turning out to protect it! The soldiers fraternized; the people cheered; and all Paris felt relieved.

Lord Brougham—French Republic.

Lord Brougham is a queer genius. He gives Punch always a subject, and he is sure to improve it. The following correspondence, certainly, is rich in fun, and we shall not hear the last of it. Plain Henry Brougham, or citizen Brougham, was all he could receive in France! Yet he must be Lord Brougham in England! But the correspondence will speak for itself:

We have received, says the *Debats*, official communications, by which it appears that Lord Brougham, or rather *Citizen* Brougham, has really demanded his naturalization as a Frenchman. The following are the documents referred to:

Lord Brougham to the Minister of Justice.

Lord Brougham has the honor to present his homage to the Minister of Justice, and wishing to become naturalized in France, he has demanded certificates from the Mayor of Cannes (Var) where he has resided for thirteen years, and where he possesses an estate, and is building a chateau.

These certificates will be forwarded direct to the Minister, and Lord Brougham begs him to sign the act of naturalization with as little delay as possible.

Paris, April 7, 1848.

Letter from the Minister of Justice to Lord Brougham.

Paris, April 8, 1848.

My Lord: I consider it proper to point out to you the consequences which will cause if you obtain the naturalization which you request. In France sign as one of her sons, you cease to be an Englishman; you are no longer Lord Brougham, you become Citizen Brougham. You instantly lose all your titles to nobility—the privileges, all the advantages, of whatever nature they may be, which you enjoy from your quality as an Englishman, and all the rights which the laws and customs of England confer on you, and which cannot be reconciled with our law of equality between all citizens. It would be thus, my Lord, even if the English laws were not so rigorous with regard to English citizens who demand and obtain their naturalization in a foreign country. It is in this sense you must write to me.

I must well suppose that an ex-Lord Chancellor of England is well aware of the necessary consequences of such an important request; but it is nevertheless the duty of the Minister of Justice of the French Republic, to give you official warning of it. When you shall have made a request in the spirit of these declarations, it shall be examined. Accept, &c.,

Ad. Crémieux.

Reply of Lord Brougham to the above Letter.

London, April 1, 1848.

Monsieur le Ministre: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th.

I could never have felt any doubt that, in making myself naturalized as a French citizen, I should lose all my rights as an English peer, and English subject in France. I could only enjoy my privileges as an Englishman when in England—in France, I should be what the laws of France grant to the citizens of the Republic.

As I desire, before all things, the