declare, emphatically and unanimously, their dissent from any judgment impeaching a career officially so honorable, energetic, catholic and upright.

DAVID MAGIE, WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS,
WILLIAM ADAMS, BENJAMIN C. CUTLER,
NEHEMIAH ADAMS.

New-York, March 30, 1858.

THE UNANIMOUS ADOPTION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FOREGOING MINUTE AND ACT OF THE PUBLISHING COMMITTEE.

In reaching these conclusions, the Publishing Committee have throughout been aided by conference with, and suggestions from their brethren forming the other portion of the Executive Committee. In fact, although the question—relating as it did to the issue of publications—was in its form the responsibility primarily of the Publishing Committee, yet in its substance it has been regarded and discussed finally as the common responsibility of the whole Executive Committee, to whom collectively the resolutions accompanying the report of the Committee of Fifteen make reference. The result of such patient and general deliberations has been a cordial and earnest unanimity. The Executive Committee are together in this matter, clear in the judgment, and hearty and undivided in the expression of that judgment.

The positions upon which they rest are then, briefly stated, these:

I. For the action of the Society at its anniversary of 1857, as adopted upon the recommendation of the Committee of Fifteen, it had been hoped, as that Committee explicitly state, that it would "meet the approbation of their Christian friends in all parts of our country." The Publishing and Executive Committees setting themselves, in all candor and prudence and honesty, to carry these recommendations into execution, found another state of sentiment than that thus anticipated. Christians of the Southern and South-Western States most earnestly and generally disapproved; and many of the firm friends of the Society at the North sympathized in such dissent. There is a large conservative interest in the Northern Churches, devout, liberal, and laborious as friends of the Society, who, though in preference reticent on the first outbreak of strife, are fixed and staunch in deprecating any rent with the Union. It was evident that any publication upon the topic would dismember the Society, and must recall or exclude our Southern colporteurs, and clog or utterly choke the channels at the South and South-West for the further circulation of any of the works bearing our imprint. This was not mere apprehension. We had the personal assurance of some of our best Southern laborers. There were colporteurs withdrawn or excluded, funds withholden, and measures initiated for the entire separation of our Southern auxiliaries, which process of rending has been arrested only by the present position of the Executive Committee. It was a change in the whole state of the field from that assumed as probable in the anniversary proceedings. Loyalty to the entire constituency, and even to the Northern friends of the movement, forbade further action upon recommendations which had been expressly predicated on another supposed state of affairs than that which was now found to exist.

II. But the resolutions recommending such new publication had not stood alone. As a conservative counterpoise to any rash action under them, there had been, in and by the Committee of Fifteen, added other resolutions equally binding, the one of which, the ninth, expressing confidence in the wisdom of the Executive Committee, anticipated of them action tending "to promote the widest and best usefulness of this Society throughout our whole country." It had the emphasis of position. It was the final resolution, the closing sentence, and the last word of the Committee of Fifteen—to borrow a scriptural phrase, "the conclusion of the whole matter." It was the closing charge of a report which, in its opening sentences, had explicitly declared that it was not the province of the Society to take up in theology or morals what were "disputed questions." This ninth resolution carried yet higher the restriction. It was known that in its original shape it had explicitly named the fifteen Slave States as needing to be kept open; and though that express illustration had been withdrawn, the general principle remained, and was thus emphatically announced. Those States could not be held out of, and forming no part in, "our whole country." No logic of construction could carve them apart. We were not to sacrifice "the widest usefulness" of the Society. If we denationalized it—if the bridge spanning the whole confederacy, as we took it in charge at the one anniversary, was to have its central arch by our act cut out, and the structure be given up at our next anniversary in the new condition of being no longer a thoroughfare—could we claim to have respected orders, guarded the trust interest, or conserved the Society's usefulness?

III. Nor could it be claimed that the Society, in its anniversary of 1857, had a clear intention of requiring the publication at all risks, and even should Christians of the Southern and South-Western States in consequence secede. The unanimity in accepting the report and resolutions of the Committee of Fifteen barred such claim. Whatever may be thought as to the relative strength of numbers for or against severance, no anniversary of the Society ever yet held would have given an unanimous vote for separation. That the vote on the report was unanimous here, and that it was regarded at the hour as cause of thanksgiving to God, was evidence that, in the judgment of the Society so hailing it, separation was not intended by the report, and need not be expected. If instructions be conflicting, or their language debatable, the intention of the body giving them is an element of interpretation in guiding the subordinate parties that receive the instructions. That intention in this case never was to sever and denationalize the Society.

IV. The Publishing and Executive Committee were but a subordinate body, acting with limited powers under a Society itself occupying by its Constitution a platform of certain limits as to object and work. In cases of doubt or debate as to the acts of subordinates, it is a rule of common morality, that if the powers be doubtful, the act should not be, if it can be avoided, such as to be irrevocable. If the superior and appointing power have failed to give explicit instructions, his subordinate ought not to enter on any novel course, which his superior, if dissatisfied, would be unable to revise. By arresting publication, the Executive Committee saved the question entire and intact, for the Society, the superior body. If the Society wish it, they can proceed, if constitutionally so empowered. All lost is but the delay of a few months. But had the subordinate body assumed, in spite of the debate as to their rights, the authority, and made the publication, their act would have been irrevocable. The separation once made, the Society would have found itself at its next anniversary impotent to remedy, however much they might regret it. Action by a subordinate, in such dubious cases, when involving result which the superior body cannot recall, is but the unwarrantable arrogation of powers not rightfully given.

V. The action of this Committee was further embarrassed by the fact that the issuing of such publications on the subject of Slavery in the then existing state of public sentiment would have been regarded by many friends of the Society as a palpable infringement of our Constitution. It is not the object of the Committee in this paper to discuss the Society's constitutional powers; but they could not ignore the fact that the issuing of such tracts under the circumstances would have been regarded as in conflict with the Constitution as understood by surviving founders of the Society (in the Executive Committee and among its officers), by the entire body of evangelical Christians at the South, and by many of its firm friends at the North; and as in conflict with the policy which had made it its course of harmonious action through the former years of its existence.

Publishing Committee.

DAVID MAGIE. WILLIAM ADAMS.
WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS. BENJAMIN C. CUTLER.
NEHEMIAH ADAMS.

Distributing Committee.

WILLIAM FORREST. ALFRED M. TREDWELL.
WILLIAM WINTERTON. OLIVER H. LEE.
ALFRED S. BARNES.

Finance Committee.

RICHARD T. HAINES. RICHARD S. FELLOWES.
MOSES ALLEN. GEORGE N. TITUS.
THOMAS C. DOREMUS. OLIVER E. WOOD.

Executive Committee.

New-York, March 30, 1858.

After the reading, the Rev. Dr. MAGIE of Elizabeth, N. J. (a member of the Executive Committee), obtained the floor, and made a speech, going over substantially the same ground with the report, attempting to vindicate the Committee's action, and declaring that if they had acted otherwise the result would have been the dismemberment of the Society.

Bishop MCILVAINE of Ohio moved the adoption of the report, and in a speech of great length advocated the Committee's policy in the past year. He said he was one of the original members of the Society; that before its formation the late Dr. Milnor wrote to him of its contemplated organization, requesting him to become a member; and that he was now the oldest-elected Vice-President—not only the longest elected, but the oldest of its Vice-Presidents. At the time of the organization a state of feeling prevailed among the various evangelical denominations, now difficult to be appreciated by those not witnesses of affairs; and there was great solicitude respecting the possibility of such a Society, formed of men of different ecclesiastical connections, and holding different religious views, remaining long in harmonious and successful operation. He became a member, after having carefully examined the constitution, and took active part in its public and private meetings till 1832, when he removed to the West. He mentioned, also, that he had probably written more of the tracts than any other man. But though he had not mingled in its anniversaries for many years, yet he had not, during that time, lost any of his attachment to the Society. When he came to the city to attend the meeting of this year, he found "men's hearts failing them for fear," and he would not disguise his apprehension that serious detriment and forcible ruin might result to the Society from that day's proceedings. He would not in detail state the Committee's action for past years—it was too complicated to be spread out except at great loss of time; moreover, it was too well known to need rehearsal. He quoted the Report of the Committee of Fifteen, of 1857, and said that the other Committee, in attempting to carry them out, found themselves environed with difficulties of three kinds; that by the resolutions the Society could not allow itself to become an agent for the promotion of any special reform such as "Anti-Slavery;" that the Committee were told to exclude the "political aspects" of Slavery, as not belonging properly to their sphere of publication; and that nothing was to be published that would not meet the "approbation of all Evangelical Christians." How to construct a tract against Slavery, and still comply with these instructions, the Committee could not satisfactorily to themselves determine; and he ventured to say that no man in Protestant America could write a tract that would meet the "approbation of all Evangelical churches." Moreover, they heard from the quarter in which the proposed tract or tracts were to be circulated, that no publications on the subject of Slavery would be acceptable or tolerated. They found themselves encompassed with serious and embarrassing difficulties. What could they do, They resolved, not knowing what better they could do, to do nothing; and they did nothing. The action mentioned in the report, therefore, which he moved to approve, was not action so much as inaction. He approved their inaction. He thought that to approve their stand-still would not be to compromise the Slavery question. A member's vote to approve would have no necessary reference to his Pro-Slavery or his Anti-Slavery views. It could not commit him in the least. Men might have radical Anti-Slavery views, yet they did not attempt to force them upon the Society, or make the Society force them upon the world. He also argued against publishing on the subject of Slavery on the ground of what he called unconstitutionality; but if the Society could depart from its past course to publish on that subject, why could it not make a further departure and publish on some other subjects not now included in its circle of themes. If the Publishing Committee should yield to the present pressure to issue tracts against Slavery, would they not then be ready to yield to some other pressure to issue tracts on some other subject equally improper and equally inexpedient? The Publishing Committee were unwilling to inaugurate such a policy. They foresaw to what it would lead, and refused to set it in motion. He believed that they would be justified for so doing by the constituency and Society. Moreover, if the Publishing Committee (in the election of which the greatest denominational safeguards are taken) are to be directed in regard to what they shall publish by the chance decision of a majority at any annual meeting, it will be only necessary to make an effort to secure a large attendance of any special sect or party, packed for the occasion, to destroy the catholic character of the Society, and to turn all its agencies to the promotion of sectarian or partisan views. He, therefore, as an Episcopalian, resisted the innovating policy proposed by those who refused to acquiesce in the course of the Committee.

Prof. CROSBY of New-York, read some passages from the tract "Sambo and Toney," in which the duties of slaves to masters are set forth. He was opposed altogether to the introduction of the question of Slavery into the Society's tracts, but as it had been introduced into this tract—in which the slave was instructed what to do—he thought that, for the sake of consistency, a similar tract should be issued to masters, instructing *them* in like manner.

Dr. WILLIAM ADAMS said that this tract was not issued during the past year, but previously. He was then asked if it was still circulated by the Society. It was ascertained that copies were still sold at the Tract House, and that one had been bought there within a few days.

The Rev. Dr. TYNG, who had made several ineffectual attempts to get the floor, was then called for by the house. He began by expressing a desire that no untoward circumstances might destroy the harmony of so important a meeting; that the Spirit of God might be present during its deliberations, and that the results might commend themselves to every man's conscience in the fear of God. He said that no man could have a greater attachment for the Tract Society than he himself had; that thirty-one years ago he spoke at its anniversary, and had spoken repeatedly on subsequent occasions; that he had always advocated its interests, and sustained its policy; that there is not an agency in the whole country of more moral importance and value than this institution, except the Church of God. He referred to the remarks of Bishop McIlvaine, on the constitutionality of instructions by the Society to the Publishing Committee, and he entirely dissented from the views of his esteemed friend. He said that he had confidence in the sincerity and fidelity of the Committee, and hoped that the Society would give expression to a similar feeling, by reelecting them to their posts. He thought that a more competent or faithful Committee could not be selected. He believed that they had acted conscientiously, according to their own convictions of duty, and that however they might come short in a course of action which many of the best friends of the Society desired to see reversed, he hoped that no manifestation of a withdrawal of their confidence would be made. But while he had long agreed with the Committee in former years, in the present case he said that a vote approving their report would by no means cover the ground on which he wished to stand. There were other issues to be discussed, and other circumstances to be considered. He would willingly have refrained from a personal participation in the discussion, yet duty had compelled him to be present, in circumstances burdensome yet blessed—burdensome in the weakness of the flesh, yet blessed in the universal sympathy of a fraternal and heavenly spirit. He was opposed to the original introduction of the subject of Slavery into the Society's discussions and publications, when, from outside influence, it was pressed upon it in 1856. He had not since then seen occasion to change his views. It was not his good fortune to be present at the anniversary of 1857, when the Report of the Investigating Committee was presented. He was then abroad, and the first intelligence of the action at that meeting reached him at Geneva. It was a unanimous action—a result very different from what he expected. The Society at that meeting laid a foundation broad and deep, and agreed to stand upon it; and they stood upon it without a dissent, with a remarkable and surprising unanimity. The resolutions then passed he had read over and over again—sometimes as often as thrice in a single day; and he pronounced them to be, to the best of his judgment, a perfectly unexampled instance of calm, moderate, conservative and righteous judication in the premises involved. Adopted by the unanimous consent of the Society, they remained the unanimous *action* of the Society. No action of a subordinate agency could in any degree invalidate the force of these resolutions thus passed. The Committee having, during the year, attempted to carry out the principles contained therein, had failed in the ability. They had not had time enough, they had delayed, for a while, to take action; they could not see their way clear to go ahead, so they stopped. He believed that the course which they adopted, as a subordinate agency waiting for further instructions from the higher body, would not, in such a view of their inaction, be very generally unacceptable to the Society. The Society would not unreasonably demand hasty action. There was time enough. It could not be properly done in a week; it might, perhaps, not be done in a year; but it should be done. He held in his hand the resolution of last year, and another resolution which he intended to offer in place of Bishop McIlvaine's motion to approve the report. He then read the following resolution, although he did not at that time move it:

Whereas, at the annual meeting of this Society in 1857, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, viz.: "That the "political aspects of Slavery lie entirely without the proper "sphere of this Society, and cannot be discussed in its publications; but that those moral duties which grow out of the existence of Slavery, as well as those moral evils and vices which it "is known to promote, and which are condemned in Scripture, "and so much deplored by evangelical Christians, undoubtedly do "fall within the province of this Society, and can and ought to "be discussed in a fraternal and Christian spirit;" therefore,

Resolved, That the said resolution be and is hereby reaffirmed; and that the Executive Committee, now to be elected, be instructed to carry the same into full effect.

This resolution, he said, would do away with the doubts in the minds of the Committee. It was a resolution of instruction, and the instructions were explicit.

Dr. BETHUNE of Brooklyn here interrupted the speaker to inquire if he (the latter) was in order. Dr. Tyng, he said, had made a motion to lay a previous motion on the table; and a motion to lay on the table could not be debated.

Several persons then said that Dr. Tyng had not *moved*, but only *read*, a motion, which he intended *subsequently* to move. Some confusion was then created by numerous individuals trying to get the floor. The speaker asked the Chair if he was in order, and was told that if he had made no motion he was entitled to the floor, to which he replied that he had made no motion, except a little motion in the house [Laughter].

He proceeded to say that the resolutions of 1857 were entirely satisfactory to him, as he read them in a foreign land, and as he had since repeatedly read them. "The fourth resolution," said he, "was so moderate "that while it disarmed my fears in '56, it awakened "all my gratification and consent in '57. I do not see "how any set of gentlemen could devise language or "construct a resolution more perfectly free from every-"thing that could be considered as alarming in its tendency, disorganizing in its influence, or likely to be annoying or harassing to the feelings of those upon whose interests and habits it might particularly impinge. It was not a temporary or local issue. It was not a question of Slavery or Anti-Slavery. It was simply the question whether the great principles of Christian morality in the hands of the American Tract Society should have a local or a universal application. It was the question whether fornication was North or South; whether adultery was East or West; whether there is a sacredness in the marriage relation and the paternal relation—whether there is a duty of family worship—whether there are obligations upon masters to instruct their servants. These were the questions. The action of last year was merely, in the language of the first article of the Constitution, carrying out the principle of "vital godliness and sound "morality," so as to meet the approbation of "all "evangelical Christians." He continued: I should like to know what evangelical Christian North or South, East or West, would undertake to say that the language of that resolution meets his disapprobation? Who could say that this Society ought not to testify against vices growing out of certain circumstances, or against evils "deplored by evangelical Christians?" He said that an episcopal Society, more than half of whose work is in the South, had published against Slavery, and uttered a solemn and stern rebuke against the vices that grow out of slaveholding, written by a slaveholder. We do not, he continued, touch the rights of any slaveholders; we do not interfere with him where we have no right to interfere; we wish only to publish against the immoralities and vices which slaveholding is known to promote; we ask that the thousands and tens of thousands of faithful parents and masters at the South, who are longing to have the means and opportunity of direct personal influence for good upon their families, shall be permitted to have them. The question is a question of the maintenance of the fundamental principle of the Tract Society. In reaffirming, or refusing to reaffirm the resolutions of the last year, we are brought to this simple point. If we refuse to reaffirm the resolutions of last year, we refuse to reaffirm the principle embodied in the first article of the Constitution. We cannot stand upon such ground as that. Our hearts are pressed upon the line of duty in this conviction. We cannot go back from the action of last year.

Dr. Tyng concluded his remarks by again referring to his love for the Society, and his sympathy with its work in spreading the Gospel. He then moved the resolution which he had already read.

The question on Dr. Tyng's motion to lay the report of the Committee on the table was then put to vote, and apparently lost. A division was called for.

Some confusion here followed, growing out of a misunderstanding of some members as to the right of parties in the gallery to vote. The President, however, announced that none but life members and life-directors had been admitted.

Dr. TYNG said if it was agreeable, he would forego this motion to lay on the table, and move his preamble and resolution as a substitute.

The PRESIDENT said that the vote having been taken, the motion could not be withdrawn.

Chief Justice HORNBLOWER of New-Jersey disagreed with the President. He thought it could not be withdrawn except the result had been declared.

A count being called for, those voting in the affirmative rose and were counted, and it was apparent that they were in a minority of the assembly. A count of the nays was loudly insisted upon by many members.

Judge JESSUP of Pa. said that a count was unnecessary; that they who sustained Dr. Tyng's motion gave up the point as lost. Many, however, still insisting upon the count, the nays were called upon to rise, and it was found that they constituted a large majority of the house.

Much confusion followed, and after some attempts to do away with the necessity of counting the nays, it was dispensed with.

Judge JESSUP took the floor, and simultaneously a member moved the previous question. The motion only increased the confusion, and in the midst of mingled cries of "Jessup" and "Question," the Rev. Dr. DE WITT twice arose and asked that the motion for the previous question be not passed through. He (Dr. De Witt) was with the majority. His words, however, were not heeded, and the Rev. Dr. BETHUNE essayed to secure Judge Jessup a hearing, and with better success.

Quiet being restored, Judge JESSUP proceed with his remarks. He said he claimed nothing but the rights of an individual member, and he rose in the exercise of such right to offer an amendment to the resolution, which, if adopted, would, he thought, remove all difficulties.

Judge Jessup's preamble and resolution was as follows:

Whereas, At the annual meeting of this Society in 1857, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, namely: "That "the political aspects of Slavery lie entirely without the proper "sphere of this Society, and cannot be discussed in its publications, but that those moral duties which grow out of the existence of Slavery, as well as those moral evils and vices which it "is known to promote, and which are condemned in Scripture, "and so much deplored by evangelical Christians, undoubtedly do "fall within the province of this Society, and can and ought "to be discussed in a fraternal spirit;" and

Whereas, The precise intention and meaning of the Society in the provisions of the said resolutions is deemed doubtful by the Executive Committee and others; therefore

Resolved, That the said resolution be hereby reaffirmed, and that the now to be elected are instructed to carry the same into effect.

Dr. BETHUNE said he was requested by the Rev. Dr. Spring to say that one statement of the preamble was wrong—that in which it was stated that the resolution was adopted unanimously; that he (Dr. Spring) did not vote for them, and he (Dr. B.) would say that he had not voted for them. Chancellor Frelinghuysen had come to him (Dr. B.) and asked him to second the resolutions, but he knew very well that a set of resolutions coming from the principal editor of *The Independent* were not safe for him to second or indorse. [Laughter and hisses].

JOHN JAY called Dr. Bethune to order.

The Rev. Dr. DE WITT asked that the sanctity of the house be not violated by any demonstrations of applause or disfavor.

The Rev. Dr. BACON of Connecticut inquired if Dr. Spring or Dr. Bethune voted against it.

Dr. BETHUNE—No, Sir; that is *mem. con.* unanimously [Laughter.]

Confusion again arose, and the cries of "Question" were renewed. In the midst of this a member insisted upon an immediate vote, as the convenience of business men, who could not be detained without a loss, should be consulted.

The Rev. Dr. BACON said that if gentlemen had notes to pay they could attend to it. The Society must attend to its duties.

Judge JESSUP endeavored to get a hearing in support of his resolution, and for several minutes awaited silence.

R. M. BLATCHFORD said he would second Judge Jessup's resolution for the purpose of bringing the matter into a position where he could call for the previous question.

Silence being at last restored, Judge Jessup proceeded, after stating that he had no desire to trespass upon them if it was the desire to take a vote upon the previous question, against which he should interpose no objection.

The motion for the previous question, however, was assisted upon with great tenacity by a member, evidently a clergyman, seated in one of the front pews.

The Rev. Dr. KREBS stated that it was evident that it was the wish of the assembly that the previous question be not now called.

After some persuasion, the member withdrew his motion for the previous question, and Judge Jessup was allowed to continue.

He alluded to the general satisfaction which had been given everywhere by the adoption of the report in 1857 submitted by the Committee of Fifteen, as being a final settlement of the vexed question. That Committee had met and acted in the most conservative spirit, and the effect of the action now proposed would be to throw that whole question broadcast upon the land for agitation. He did consider that the fourth resolution adopted at the last meeting was the gathering together of conservative views upon this question, and putting them upon a basis on which the friends of the Society, with the exception of extremists on either side, could meet; and the mass of minds that they had met agreed that the adoption of a resolution that they could properly and consistently publish upon the subject of those duties that involve millions of our fellow men in the relative position of masters and slaves, was a concession such as all the conservative men of this Society ought to accept as sufficient. They did accept it as sufficient, and for the first time he had learned now there was any feeling of dissent. He did not remember certainly, but he thought that the annual report of that meeting would show that the vote upon the resolutions was a unanimous one of the Society. But what if one, three, or fifty guilty men did not concur in that action? Was their silence to detract from the force of the unanimity of the proceedings at the time. It was no vote of surprise or misapprehension. The principle adopted there was clear, plain and palpable; and his heart was overwhelmed. A venerable man now in his grave (Dr. Knox) moved that they give prapers and thanks giving to God for the happy result. The position the Society then took was this, that it was competent for the Society to publish upon the subject of the duties arising out of the institution of Slavery as it exists. Were there any evils there—and evils among Christian men, and which needed to be rebuked, and which needed to have Christian counsel and guidance? If so, where was it to come from? He asked, when the thousands of colporteurs were traversing all that region of country, if there was no word of advice to those brethren in the trials under which they labored? Might they not open their minds and give them one word of advice amid their trials and temptations? If the Tract Society, knowing the fact, were not to be allowed to speak a kind fraternal word, he wanted to know in what manner were they to operate there. He offered the resolution to confirm the action of last year upon the ground that that action had been evidently misunderstood. The Committee said that they did not arrive at a satisfactory conclusion upon the subject; that the resolutions, in their apprehension, were such that they could not decide if their duty was to publish in relation to the duties of masters, unless they should be perfectly satisfied that their action would meet the approbation of Christians, North and South and everywhere else. They doubted whether there was instruction, and whether the principle had been affirmed by the Society. His motion was to amend this report, to make no objection to approval upon what had been said; the action of the Committee had been negative action. They had declined to do anything, for reasons that surrounded them. With that view of the matter he was willing to vote for the adoption of the report; but he was not willing to have it go to the world that this Society, in adopting that resolution, adopted the idea that it never could or would publish in relation to the duties of masters and slaves. He was unwilling to have the record of this Society erased. He was unwilling to take back anything this Society had said with regard to Slavery, and thus say that they might not utter one word of Christian counsel to the vast multitude at the South to whom they had access.

In conclusion, Judge JESSUP said he was willing to vote for the adoption of the report if they would accept the amendment to confirm the action of the Society of the previous year.

Again the house was the scene of confusion. Members called loudly for the previous question, amid the cries of different speakers. At last Dr. Bethune made his voice heard. He said he was anxious to say a very few words upon the subject. He had before been cut off by mingled demonstrations of applause and some flatulent gentlemen mingling their manifestations with it. When he said he knew he could not support the resolution that was moved by the gentleman, he did it not because he was unwilling to associate with him in any proper movement; but from the antecedents of that gentleman in connection with the paper he represented, he knew it would be impossible for him to go with him on that subject.

The Rev. Dr. THOMPSON—Of course the meeting will have the courtesy to hear me in reply to Dr. Bethune.

Loud vociferations of "Question," followed this inquiry of Dr. Thompson, in the midst of which R. M. BLATCHFORD moved the previous question, which was put to vote and carried.

A count was demanded by many voices, but Judge JESSUP said that there was no doubt of the feeling of the meeting, and he hoped there would be no attempt to press a count.

The Rev. Dr. BACON of New-Haven took the floor. He had hardly completed the first sentence of his remarks before the meeting was again in confusion. Loud cries of "Free speech," "Bacon," "Question," mingled with a few hisses, were heard, in the midst of which Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio, hoped the house would extend the same courtesy to Dr. Bacon that they had to him.

A VOICE—We have had two on the other side. We want the question now.

Mr. WHITMORE—Friends of the Tract Society, I hope you will allow free discussion if it takes the whole day. [Applause.] If you want to subserve the best interests of the Society, hear both sides and then come to a righteous conclusion. [Confusion, and cries of "Question."]

Dr. BACON—I shall stand here until you are weary of making that noise. [Confusion, and cries of "Question," "Bethune."].

Dr. THOMPSON moved an adjournment to 3½ o'clock, to meet the convenience of business men. [Cries of "No," "He has the floor," "Go on," "Question."]

The PRESIDENT—Order, Sir, if you can gain a hearing. [Confusion.]

Dr. BACON—I have the floor, and I shall hold it until I am heard.

HIRAM KETCHUM arose in the gallery, amid the excitement, and said he hoped it would be conceded by his fellow-citizens present that there was some business under heaven entitled to consideration except business in Wall street. They had met on a most solemn subject, and he hoped they would hear what was to be said. He had no doubt that the majority of the assembly were all right, but they would not be right if they did not hear the minority. The right of the minority to be heard was an American right. Let them talk, and the meeting hear them patiently. [Applause.]

Dr. BACON—I want to say at the outset that I am grateful to the gentlemen in the executive administration of the Society for the pains they have taken to secure good order and good behavior in this meeting. [Laughter.] I would much rather be beaten in a meeting like this, than be triumphant in such a one as that two years ago in the Brick Church. I came here supposing, as I still suppose, that the Committee of the Tract House, in making their arrangements for this meeting, acted in good faith; that they expected there would be a free, fair, and courteous discussion of their question to be decided to-day. Now what is that question? Let every man, under his responsibility to God and to the Lord Jesus Christ, the judge of the quick and dead, be sure that he *knows* what the question is upon which he is voting.

Two years ago the question was misunderstood. The Committee of Fifteen made a report, accepted unanimously, in which they stated as the proper line of policy for the Society, what is perfectly satisfactory to me, who have been held up to reproach as having proposed a revolutionary and disorganizing procedure. That is just what I wanted; and I hold that that, properly understood, is just what every Christian man in this assembly wants. I wish gentlemen to recollect the very clear, lucid, and impressive statements made by Dr. Tyng. Suppose that the resolution, passed last year unanimously, is set aside—as it will be, as it is intended to be, and this is the reason why the amendment which has been voted out out was voted out. Suppose those resolutions of 1857 are abrogated! Think—think! Men, brethren, Christian citizens of the United States! think for a moment in what position you place this great Christian institution! What is that resolution? what is the meaning of it? Not that the question of Slavery, as an institution, as an organization of society, shall be discussed; not that this Society shall print commentaries on the Dred Scott decision, or shall put on its catalogue of publications the publications of the American Anti-Slavery Society, or anything of that kind; not that it shall publish anything about the truth, the Christian verity, on which any evangelical Christians can forcibly differ. No, Sir; nothing of that kind. The question is this: Has the law of God been written on tables of stone, and thundered from Sinai? Is the law of Christ, the Son of God, reannounced in the Sermon on the Mount, abrogated in the present case of the institution of Slavery? That is the question. And by rescinding the action of last year, you give an *affirmative answer* to that question. Here it is: Is fornication among slaves abrogated? Is sin among slaves abrogated? Is there a right to sunder a wife and husband, and put them in new connections? Is there a right to seize an unoffending child and use it as a chattel? These are the questions! Does the existence of Slavery abrogate the first and common principles of Christian morality? As I heard it well stated yesterday, the peculiarity of this case is that the Tract Society is going to break down, not on a question of reformatory ethics, but on a question of common morality. What is meant by that is this. The principle of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks is a principle of reformatory morality; getting drunk is a violation of common morality. The principle that slaveholding is a sin in all forcible circumstances is a principle of reformatory morality; the principle that I have a right, because the law gives me power to make a man work for nothing, and to treat him as if he were one of my oxen, is a violation of common, universal Christian morality. This is the question on which we are acting in adopting this report, pure and simple. I want that to be understood, and I want gentlemen here—I want Christians here, in the presence of the Holy Spirit, who, we believe, has so largely blessed our churches within the past few months—if they are going to vote for that, to do it with their eyes open; to know what they are doing; to know in what position they are placing this great Christian institution by rescinding the resolutions of last year—which they *do* rescind, clearly, intelligently, unequivocally by the adoption of this report.

Now I have another word to say; and that is this. Does anybody suppose that the abrogation of the action of last year is going to be a *finality*? Sir, I believe that God governs the world; and I don't believe in the long run the devil is to beat. I have faithness, I know assuredly, that nothing in this world is settled till it is settled right. Now, gentlemen may suppose that I am going to clear out and abdicate all connection with this Society, for this back step. I tell them, No! I am a *life*-member of the Tract Society, and not only that, but a *life*-director; and while I *live*, I will never be content with such a position as that by which this Society is now crowded, by these tumultuous cries. Never! For I am to be heard here again and again, as long as I have a voice to speak, or a hand to write. I am a life-member; and not only so, but I have children who are life-members, and who, I hope, will keep up this war in behalf of God and of man, by-and-by, after I shall have gone to my grave, and *my* pulpit shall be draped in mourning (alluding to the pulpit covered with crape, in mourning for the late Rev. Dr. Knox). I have one here to-day; and I have one, a little fellow, just beginning to talk, who glories in being a life-member of the Tract Society. And I trust that when my voice has ceased, their voices shall be heard year after year, and remember the great grief that has crushed—no, not crushed—but has pierced the heart of the brother who first spoke on this side of the question. I remember his sorrow in standing here, coming from the recent grave of an illustrious and sanctified son; and I know that I may taste peradventure of that cup of sorrow—I *have* tasted it, and I know how to sympathise with him; but I say, that living, I maintain this conflict till it is settled right, and dying, I bequeath it to my children, and if they are not permitted to survive me, I bequeath it to those who shall come after me!

The Rev. Dr. BETHUNE said that he had a few words to offer. He wished to protest against the doctrine that the action which the evident majority of the meeting seemed to take for granted, that to adopt the report is to rescind the action of last year. He said that the vote last year was not unanimous, as had been said. Dr. Spring had just mentioned to him that he did not vote for it; and he himself (the speaker) would say that he was another.

Voices—Did you vote *against* it?

Dr. BETHUNE—No, I did not vote against it; nor did I vote for it.

Voices—Then the vote was unanimous; it was *mem. con.*

Dr BETHUNE—It would have been impossible for these resolutions to have passed if they had been considered on all sides to have been a compromise, and if those opposed to carrying Slavery into the publications of the Society had not supposed that by the last resolution they had made themselves completely safe. Dr. Bacon had ranked some of the members of the Society among the children of the devil, and has threatened to pursue them with the young Bacons. Because he was sure of victory in the end. But the speaker wanted to be on the side of truth and righteousness. He said that if the Society wanted to say to the South that adultery is a sin, they might say it in a tract on adultery, without any mention of Slavery. He called himself an Anti-Slavery man—not as the phrase is technically considered to mean, but a man in favor of Freedom, and opposed to Slavery. If any man should say otherwise of him, he would be a calumniator. He spoke of his affectionate interest in the Tract Society, and his solicitude for its prosperity and success. He alluded to his own efforts in its behalf, and also to his grandmother, Mrs. Isabella Graham. When he was to go into something like a consultation, he refused, and said to the gentlemen who invited him that they had thrown him overboard in 1856, and that he would not sail under their flag now. They then gave him up to the exultations of enemies, and he and a few others had been ridiculed as "Union-savers." That last action of the Committee he opposed. He did not go for the Committee of Investigation. He did not go for the Committee of Fifteen; but he did not then see how they could unite where they afterward did. It was claimed as an Abolition triumph. That claim was not a true one; although he did not like the resolutions of last year, for they were "Delphic," and could be interpreted one way or another. A previous speaker had said that the conflict was not over, but he (Dr. B.) would warn him against the results of such agitation. And if that gentleman meant to be firm, he also meant to be as firm. He would not submit to such a constant agitation as had been proposed, and would say to the gentleman who proposed it that if it was necessary, in resisting it, to resort to extreme measures, the right of the Society to peace and harmony, at the will of a majority, would be vindicated in a Court of Justice! (This remark occasioned a loud expression of applause. He said that gentlemen had proposed an organic change. [Voices—"No," "No such proposition," &c.]. They might say no, but that was what they proposed. The fidelity on the part of the Society to trust would forbid any such change. He believed that there would be a way opened for the emancipation of slaves, and that it would be through the preaching of the Gospel, by means of such agencies as the Tract Society. He wanted the Society to be sustained. He wanted it to remain unperverted. He wanted to know what would become of the South if the Gospel should be excluded from it. He said that the most eloquent Anti-Slavery tract that he knew anything about was Paul's Epistle to Philemon.

Dr. Bethune's remarks were protracted to considerable length, but owing to the already undue length of this report, we have been compelled thus to give merely a brief summary of his speech.

At the conclusion of Dr. Bethune's speech, Dr. THOMPSON took the floor, amid cries of "question," and was greeted with hisses. After waiting a brief time for the excitement to subside, he made an effort to be heard, but without success. Subsequently, comparative silence being restored, he said:

I have the floor, and shall hold it until ten o'clock to-night if I be not heard. [Cries of "question," "go on," mingled with hisses.] I rise, Sir, to speak on the motion before the house—namely, to approve the action of the Executive Committee. [Confusion.] I propose, Sir, to offer a slight modification, which I am persuaded will harmonize the views of the meeting on that action. But first I must allude to certain incidental matters, in order that I may proceed unembarrassed to the main question. Before I came to this meeting, I jocosely remarked to a friend that if my worthy brother Bethune should speak, the first thing he would do would be to denounce *The Independent* and my humble self. I have seen that prediction verified. If any one will look at us, he will observe that we are constitutionally at different poles. [Laughter.] Last year, when I took the positive pole, he took the negative. With reference to the motion, then, I made it at the request of an honored and revered brother, though with my hearty concurrence. It was all that I had ever asked; and, though I never like to indulge in any strong language in that direction, I will follow the precedent of the last man; if, after what I shall now utter, any man shall say that I ever desired any organic change in this Society, that I have endeavored to transform it into an Anti-Slavery Society, that I have ever desired to have the publications on Slavery made prominent, or that I have endeavored to Abolitionize this Society in any way—he will state what is an untruth. I now challenge any man—and I pause for the gentleman himself to make the charge and prove it here—that I have ever written or spoken anything to the contrary of that. In the very first declaration I ever made on this subject, I stated most emphatically that we desired no such thing as that this society should be transformed from its great national, catholic universal object of promoting sound morality and evangelical religion through the Gospel of Christ, into an agency of any kind for any specific moral reform. I utterly deny that, and I stand before this assembly and challenge any man to adduce from my pen or quote from my life any utterance to the contrary. Let that stand, therefore, if Dr. Bethune's statement shall stand; and I honor it and accept it concerning himself. I have another statement to make with reference to that action of last year. I moved the acceptance of the report heartily, and did it at the request of an honored and revered brother, and I am permitted to see this venerated father by my side (turning to Dr. Spring). He, at the close of the meeting, took me by the hand and said, "I am glad that "you moved the acceptance of that report. I was "about to rise to it, but it was better that it should "come from you.

Dr. SPRING stated to the speaker in an undertone that he was mistaken.

Dr. THOMPSON (to Dr. Spring)—My dear Sir, I remember it, but I will not put my recollection against yours. [Cries of "Question."] Now, Sir, what we ask is very simple. I hold in my hand a tract. [Cries of "Question," amid great confusion.] I hold in my hand a tract issued my the Society, and called "Sambo and Toney."

Dr. ADAMS—Not since last year.

Dr. THOMPSON—Before I refer to it, I will call for the reading by the Chairman of the Committee, of the report concerning that tract, if it was written. Am I in order in making that request?

A VOICE—When was it published?

Dr. THOMPSON—It has been published within the last year.

Dr. ADAMS—The tract has not been printed in a long time.

Dr. THOMPSON—I affirm that that is now issued, and that it has been bought since the last anniversary at the office of the Tract Society in Nassau street. It has been said that it contains no recognition of Slavery. I will read from it, (confusion and cries of "question.")

"Sambo—But suppose do don't live till you're old—do you see many on your plantation like to be old?

Mr. President, do they have plantations in the North? [Confusion and cries of "Order."] Again, Sambo says: "Suppose you should run away from "your master, and never come back till you get old, "and can't do any work, do you think that master "would care for you then?" * * * "May be you think "he don't preach to you, because he don't say, 'Now, "colored people, I speak to you.'" And Toney says, "One day when Joe was working in the field" * * * "thanked the Lord for opening master's heart to "let minister come and preach to us." Mr. President, is this in the North or South? Where is it? [A voice—In the South.] And in the close of this tract we read:

"Guard against self-conceit. Humility is a lovely virtue and shines nowhere more than in a serv