BUENOS AYRES.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

U. S. STEAMER SOUTHERN STAR,
OFF BUENOS AYRES, Jan. 22, 1859.

Since my last, this steamer arrived at Montevideo, after a passage of sixty-nine days from Norfolk, stopping at Barbadoes and Pernambuco to coal. She reported all well, but notwithstanding, was quarantined, whereas vessels of other nations that have arrived before and since then from Rio Janeiro and other sickly ports, have been allowed *pratique*. This does not appear to be fair play by any means, but on the contrary, an under-handed kind of business. Not only have they done this, but some trouble has arisen between Commodore Forest and the Montevidean Government, concerning the storage of coal at this port for the Paraguay expedition. The result of the affair is not known yet. I am now on my way up the river in the above steamer, the Preble having started in advance of us. More anon. In haste.

FROM THE PARAGUAY EXPEDITION.

By the arrival at this port of the barks T. Cushing and Paladin we have letters and papers from Buenos Ayres to Jan. 23, very nearly a month later than previously received.

The transport ship Release, corvette Preble, and steamer Southern Star, of the Paraguay expedition, had arrived at Montevideo, all well. The Southern Star arrived at Buenos Ayres on the 21st, having as passenger a Commissioner from Montevideo, en route for Asuncion, to try his powers of persuasion on Commissioner Bowlin and President Lopez. The Southern Star sailed the next day (23d) for Corrientes, towing the Preble.

The Harriet Lane, Fulton, and Water Witch, with the three brigs Bainbridge, Perry, and Dolphin, arrived at Rosario on the 6th, where the steamers remained for several days coaling, while the brigs made sail up the stream by themselves. *The Commercial Times* says that on the arrival of the squadron at Rosario, the local authorities immediately directed a dispatch to Admiral Stubrick, requesting to know the reason of this collection of force. The answer sent by the Admiral is not published.

On the 10th of January the squadron was at Parana, where Commissioner Bowlin and Admiral Stubrick had an interview with Urquiza, the proceedings at which had not transpired. A few days afterward Urquiza went up to the province of Corrientes, traveling overland; and rumor says he is bound to Paraguay to tender his "good offices" to Lopez. The steamer from Rio de Janeiro, which arrived at Buenos Ayres Jan. 15, brought 969,610 milreis, equal to $484,805, on freight—said to be a loan from Brazil to the Argentine Confederation.

Gen. Guido, late President of the Argentine Senate, had been appointed by Urquiza, Minister Resident at Asuncion; and Senor Amaval, late Brazilian Minister at Montevideo, has been accredited in the same capacity to Paraguay, with especial reference to the arrival of the American Expedition. These Powers have never had higher resident agents than Consuls at Asuncion hitherto.

We take the following items from *The Commercial Times* of Buenos Ayres:

"Hopes of a peaceful settlement of the (American-Paraguayo) question are much more generally entertained than previously. Lopez, it is said, will put on a warlike and fearless demeanor in order to make the best terms for himself, but without any idea of eventually coming to blows, he will cut down the claim to its lowest limits, ratifying the former treaty, and promise protection and encouragement to all enterprising American citizens who may venture to trust themselves and their schemes on Paraguayan soil. How far he may be successful in his pruning intentions, will depend upon the genius and instructions of Judge Bowlin, who is said to be a keen Yankee every inch of him, and one not likely to suffer himself to be overmatched in diplomacy. Backed as he is by a formidable squadron, under the command of a "fire-eating" Admiral, anxious no doubt to prove his worthiness of the recently bestowed honors, he is not likely to be much disposed to abate his demands, unless he has positive permission to that effect from the Cabinet at Washington.

"The other warlike rumors which last week obtained circulation, namely, of invasion from Brazil, the Oriental Republic, and the Confederation, are fast acquiring that mythical character which is the general attribute of such reports.

"The French brig-of-war Zebre was the scene of an accident last month. While in the performance of his duty, in firing a salute in honor of the American Admiral, one of the crew was severely injured in the arm, so that amputation was necessary. On this being known by the crews of the American Squadron a subscription was raised which in two or three days amounted to one thousand four hundred and odd hard dollars, which sum was placed at the disposal of the officer in command of the Zebre, and by him deposited in the Bank on account of the sufferer."

FROM PARAGUAY.

"By the *Salto de Guayra* we have dates up to the 31st December. On the 15th ultimo, President Lopez and his son, the General, accompanied by a brilliant staff, embarked on board the Tacuari and proceeded to Humaita, where they inspected the troops there encamped, and the fortifications. They are said to have been received with the greatest enthusiasm by the soldiery, who were in excellent spirits, and burned to measure their strength with the 'Yankees.' Warlike preparations were everywhere going forward with the greatest activity, and the articles of the *Semanario* continue to breathe anything rather than a desire for accommodation.

"The 25th December, being the anniversary of the independence of the country, was celebrated with great public rejoicings. Bull fights had taken place both in the morning and evening, the animals being furnished by the commercial part of the community."

ONE WEEK LATER FROM HAYTI.

We have received files of Hayti papers to Feb. 26, with over a week's later intelligence.

Capt. Phayre, of the British war vessel Basilisk, who had come to protect the interests of British residents, was presented on the 4th ult., to President Geffrard by Mr. Byron, English Vice Consul, who took the opportunity of making a long congratulatory speech to the new President. He alluded in sneering terms to the late Government. Geffrard's reply was short and dignified.

An insurrection against the new Government had already occurred at the small town of Jeremie, of which *Le Republique* gives the following account:

"Col. Noel, sent by the President, proclaimed the Republic at Jeremie on the night of Jan. 17, and the entire populace received it with enthusiasm. Gen. Delice Lespérance, then Governor of the Department of Jeremie, had apparently accepted it like the others, but his adhesion was only feigned. He speedily threw off the mask, and on the 10th of February took possession of a fort that commanded the town, and thence sent agents to incite the people. But these, far from being taken in by his fallacious promises, had the good sense to answer that they knew the President Geffrard; that they were content under his Government, and wished it every success. Seeing himself lost, Delice asked and obtained the protection of the French Consul, with whom he remained until his departure for the capital."

At Port-au-Prince Delice awaits, with two accomplices, a trial.

An attempt was made by an excited mob to break into and destroy the house of M. Salomon, the ex Minister of Finance under Soulouque. The President managed to quell the excitement, and M. Salomon had sought refuge on the British ship Basilisk.

A deputation, composed of MM. Toussaint, Senator, T. Madiou and Granville, will shortly depart for Europe, to notify officially the governments of England, France and Spain the establishment of the new Haytian Republic.

Geffrard has decreed the reorganization of the National Guard.

LATER FROM THE WEST INDIES.—We have received a file of papers from Grand Turk, Turk's Islands, but find them entirely barren of any news of importance. At Barbadoes and St. Lucia they have had abundant rains, and the fields of cane look promising. *The Royal Gazette*, of Feb. 23, says:

"The American ship Marathon, Capt. Vandike, from Philadelphia, arrived at these Islands on the 17th inst. James Winter, esq., late United States Consul at these Islands, came passenger in her. Mr. Winter is accompanied by about forty mechanics and laborers, for the purpose of commencing the establishment of salt works at the fine salina at West Caicos, 100 acres of which he has leased from the Government, on the usual terms. The ship is laden with materials and stores for this undertaking, among which are materials for the construction of an iron railway from the salina to the shipping place."

THE FAMINE IN THE NORTH.

To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.

SIR: The letter of inquiry concerning the alleged destitution in the North-West, addressed to you and published in your issue of Feb 15, it will be recollected, drew forth from "M Wagner, No. 46 Beach street," a communication disputing the statements of Mr. S. Ellis in regard to the sufferings in Dodge Co., Minnesota. "There has not been any blight," he says, "save to the wheat crop, in my portion of the "State, nor, I believe, in Dodge County. The oat "crop was unusually heavy throughout the State. "What the wheat lost by the heavy rains, the oats "gained. Corn was not only as good as usual, but, I "think, better, save in low and wet lands; and of "neither class is Dodge County." "I am not aware "crops of any kind having been injured by hail in "Minnesota during the Summer of 1858," &c., all fitted to hush any fears of suffering in any portion of Minnesota, and to give the impression that interested parties there, and sentimental busy bodies here, were playing on the humane sensibilities of the public.

Mr. Earle S. Goodrich, editor of *The Pioneer and Democrat*, St. Paul, represented in another communication the appeal in behalf of any sufferers in Minnesota "as wholly gratuitous and impertinent, as a re-"flection upon the ability and an insult to the char-"acter of the people of Minnesota." TRIBUNE, Feb. 18.

As an offset to these letters, and in justification of Mr. Ellis's statements, I ask the public attention to the following documents:

FEBRUARY 23, 1859.

MR. S. ELLIS—*Sir:* We, the undersigned, residents of Dodge County Minnesota, do hereby confirm your statement, made to the Rev. Dr. Bellows of New-York, in your note to him as published in THE DAILY TRIBUNE of the 15th inst., in relation to the destruction of the crops by blight and hail-storm of last Summer, and the consequent suffering of many of the inhabitants.

And we will further say that the destruction consequent upon this storm is not confined to this county, but extends into several counties in the southern part of this State; and that there were thousands of acres of wheat and oats not worth harvesting. Mr. Wagner's statement, notwithstanding. Hoping that you will succeed in your benevolent exertions for the benefit of the suffering everywhere. We remain yours, &c.,

GIDEON LEAVITT,	W. EDMONS,
HOMER B. LEAVITT,	A. A. MASON,
WILLIAM B. FORTER,	WILLIAM NORTON,
M. W. FORTER,	WM. T. HAVENS,
NICHOLAS GREENS,	GEORGE RANSON,
E. A. TAYLOR,	J. M. KENNEY,
WM R. HUNTLEY,	J. W. GOOFER,
LAWSON H. RICE,	GEO. W. FOLLETT,
ALEXANDER HASBROUCK,	ALFRED BIXBY,
S. J. PETTITT,	WM. JACKSON,
F. C. SEVERANCE,	PRESTON H. ELLIS,
A. T. CURTIS,	A. N. SMITH,
C. A. MILLIKEN,	C. F. HATHAWAY,
A. B. HUNTLEY,	EZRA CLARK,
E. H. DAVIS,	J. P. CRAW,
WM. WATKINS,	THOMAS BALDWIN.

WASIOJA, DODGE COUNTY, MINN., March 2, 1859.

MR. ELLIS: My attention having been called to a communication of yours relative to the suffering condition of the people in some sections of this county, published in THE TRIBUNE, and the reply of a gentleman at St. Peter, and of Mr. Goodrich of *The Pioneer and Democrat*, refuting your statements, in my respect for you, and a personal knowledge of the truth of your statements, has induced me to make a plain presentation of the facts which have come under my immediate notice.

You will remember that we had a conversation last Fall, after the hail-storm, and that I expressed an opinion that many of our people would suffer before another harvest, for the common necessities of life.

It is well known here there was no surplus of the previous year; that our farmers had spent all their money and depended on their crops for everything; that their crops—their last hope—were almost destroyed by the hail-storm which, in the space of fifteen minutes, poured monstrous stones upon the wheat, oats, corn, vines and gardens, and rendered desolation supreme. In the northern part of our county the destruction was complete, and in the beginning of the usual harvest-time the farmers had nothing to gather, and depended on the sales of their stock and their credit for the next year's subsistence. The fact that our county was drained of money, and that much stock was suddenly brought into market, rendered their means of acquiring much in this way nugatory; and as for assistance from other sections of this or the adjoining counties, they could hope for little, because wheat and oats had proved almost an entire failure on account of the rust. I do not believe there was 200 bushels of good wheat or oats raised in this county; and as the corn crop is about used up, and the farmers have some of them disposed of the last cow and horse, the prospect for the next five or six months is gloomy enough indeed. What than, is to be done? Think you they will not suffer? Business has led me to visit some of these people, who, through a sense of pride, seal their lips and will not complain, yet are they visibly in the utmost destitution, and must suffer if not relieved. Could Mr. Wagner and Mr. Goodrich see their condition they would acknowledge that the truth had not all been told. There are many, very many children here, who are so entirely destitute of shoes and other clothing, that they dare not go out of doors; some with whom you are acquainted. But I dare not mention names, they are not the kind of people that will beg.

Now, Sir, to sum up the whole matter, I do not think there is provision enough in Dodge County to serve the inhabitants thirty days, were it equally divided, and as it is not so divided, some are already suffering for food and raiment, and how will it be after a while? For you know that there are yet at least five months—five long, and I fear, hard months for some of our poor, industrious farmers—before we can expect any bread from a new crop.

I hope you will persevere, and not be discouraged. Do all you can for us. Your friend, JAMES A GARVER, M. D.

BROTHER ELLIS: We send you a very brief expression of the public opinion in regard to the destitution in Minnesota, and I wish it may do you and all concerned good. We are sorry that we cannot do more for you; there is no *sensible* man here but what treats Wagner's statement with the contempt it deserves. And as for Goodrich, I am myself pained to disagree with him in one, if not all, of his statements, for I do not believe we have enough grain or produce of all kinds, in Minnesota, to last till harvest, and of course those who have not enough cannot help those much that have nothing. But, go on in the path of duty. Why falter? You are sustained by the good and true. In haste yours, A. BIXBY.

Extract of Letters to Mr. Ellis.

SATURDAY, Feb. 26, 1859.

Again I improve a moment to fill up this blank, according to your wife's request. Preston carried tale to the office yesterday and found there another article from the editor of *The Pioneer and Democrat*, St. Paul, which you have doubtless seen ere this. He thought we might add something more to this, and as it would not go out till Monday, if he left it, he brought it back, and I took it with THE TRIBUNES containing all the articles in question, and came down to Dr. Garver to talk with him on the subject, and to get his expression in regard to the suffering and destitution here; and also in regard to the course you have taken, but unfortunately he is not at home. But his wife is a very sensible, intelligent woman, and she says she knows the Doctor will approve the course you have taken, and she thinks he will try to do something to sustain you in it, unless, possibly, he may think that the State will do something; and yet I have talked with no one as yet that thinks it is able. They think they have over-estimated the crops, because it is only the dry and sandy portions of the State, on certain rivers that have been so productive; and then so much has been carried out of the State already, and will continue to be carried as soon as navigation opens; for those that can spare must have money, and it is not here; at least the common people have it not.

Your wife suggested an idea to me this morning which she wished me to lay before Mr. Cosw (whom I rode to town with this morning) and Dr. Garver; and if they sanctioned it to give it to you, and perhaps you might be yet able to do something for this little community on your own hook. It is this: that you might, perhaps, induce your own personal friends, who have confidence in you, to give clothing such as will now be most needed; such as cotton cloth, overall stuff, blue and white shirting, or drilling and bed-ticking, (we have miserable stuff of that kind here, you know,) and stout calico for women and girls. I think she also added boots and shoes, but they can better go barefooted as they have done, clothing is more necessary. Also garden seeds. She thinks, perhaps, you might get some things yourself to sell to those who would rather pay than receive charity, if they could only have time to pay. She thinks Mr. M. would be willing to assist you in such an enterprise. I tell you, Mr. Ellis, it is a hard time for those who have been best off, and harder for those who have the worst, and it is hard to see those who are more needy than yours!", and yet feel it is not in your power to aid them. Mr. Craw has traveled in several directions for grain, out of the range of the hail-storm, and he says that he should not think, in the best places, there was bread enough for the inhabitants. Dr. Garver has just come in, and I have read all the important parts of our letters to him, and he sanctions it unequivocally and fully, and says you will hear from him in some way soon. He further wishes me to add, in regard to the last-mentioned subject, that the most of the people would rather pay for anything had, if they could have the time. He suggests that some benevolent merchant or merchants supply the people with clothing, groceries, meat, fish, and such things as are needed, and at such prices as benevolence would approve, and have them sent to a committee of men who would see to the distribution of them, and that such goods should only fall into the hands of those who would rather pay when they could than beg. The merchants here will only sell at the highest prices and for ready pay. Dr. G says that the suggestion of the Editor of the P. & D., that the State will help will not amount to much. He says that Mrs. Ellis and myself have told you correctly as far as we have gone, but that the half has not been told. Do not give yourself any uneasiness about this thing on your part, but go to work with renewed zeal, and God and a grateful community will bless you and yours. C.

DEAR SIR: As Mrs. E. is writing to you to-day, and wishes me to join her, I gladly avail myself of the opportunity. We have been considerably excited by reading in THE DAILY TRIBUNE of Feb. 17 an article from the pen of a Mr. Wagner of St Peters, which it seemed was called forth by some benevolent effort on the part of yourself and the Rev. Dr Bellows of your city, to assist the section of Minnesota so terribly devastated by the terrific hail-storm which occurred during your stay here last Summer. Mr. Ellis, Dr. Garver's fears in regard to famine before another harvest have already been realized; that is, you recollect that he said he did not know as any would actually starve, but he thought they would so suffer for want of proper food and clothing as to induce sickness, of which our nearest neighbor and several of his family have suffered and are still suffering, though the neighbors have tried to do what little they could for them. Your wife especially has administered all in her power to the wants of the sick ones, which I can assure you has called down many blessings on her and your family. We heard yesterday that a family not far off had been subsisting for some time past wholly on rutabagas or turnips, and many that have cows coming in this Spring, whose milk would be such wholesome and necessary diet, have had to (and many more will have to probably) sell them at low prices for corn to subsist on. Our school teacher was saying this morning that one man near where his father lives, which is on the border of the devastation, sold a cow to a man who had plenty of grain for $5, because he must have the grain, and the man would give no more. The country around here, as you well know, is not well supplied with cows and yet they must spare them to buy bread; and yet many might spare all they had, and will have, too doubtless, and yet not be able to buy bread sufficient for their use till harvest, to say nothing for seed for planting.

Oh, I might say a great deal on this subject, and picture the want and destitution that exist here, not only for food, but for clothing. And is it not, indeed, a merciful Providence that tempers the wind to the shorn lamb, who has softened the rigors of this cold climate, so that with the exception of two or three cold spells, it has been much milder and pleasanter than any dared to hope? But, Mr. E., I tell you, when I think of the course that Mr Wagner has taken (for he must be a purely selfish man—it does not seem possible but that he knew of the hail-storm), I am just ready enough to wish that he might have been well pelted with some of the largest of the stones, of which I suppose that even we saw not the largest, for some nearly three north of me they were seven inches in diameter, and stripped the trees bare as Autumn, and made the ground look as if newly plowed.

The men about here are talking of showing THE TRIBUNE of the 15th and 17th, certainly the latter, to some of the most prominent men in town, and to ask them to write to THE TRIBUNE hoping that something may yet be done for the relief of the suffering here; but they may for ought we know prove to be as selfish as did the very benevolent Mr. Wagner; but if so the women and children will send a cry that I hope will be heard and regarded by all good and benevolent men of your city. The time as Mr W. says that everything is sold at low prices; but what avails that to those who have nothing to buy with, and if they cannot buy now, what will they do when everything is held at double the price it now is, and it doubtless will be soon, for prices are now raising fast again. Mr. W. says that more grain was raised by the State than will be needed for the bread facts. All do not think so, and if there was it was destroyed last fall, at least all that would pay transport, for there is that grain to spare must have money for it, and one only wants to know the percentage here, to know it is source. It does seem that great suffering if not actual starvation awaits many of our people, if not promptly relieved soon by the bounty of those who have means and hearts to help. May the Lord bless the good and benevolent to aid us is the hope of many. So mote it be.

It is said that the hailstorm extended into Steele County, and that they are suffering there. Also in Freeborn County where many new settlers went in last year they are suffering for they sower instead of planting mostly; and this not true in this section that even oats were good. Dr Garver says that if it should prove to be a plan that could be carried out (I mean the sending of things here) that if it could be, it would be cheaper to pay the things, as they would come at nearly half the expense, and could be insured, for there is no money in the County except in such hands as will keep it. Yours most truly,

CATHARINE BIXBY.

These letters must convince any one that, however painful to State pride or landed interests the fact may be, destitution to a painful and alarming extent exists in parts of Minnesota—sufficient to justify the inhabitants in asking temporary relief, and to make it the duty of those who are called upon, be they near or remote, to consider some judicious means of assisting them.

In regard to Michigan, it is my duty to make known that I have received two numbers, Feb. 22 and March 1, of *The Greenville Independent*, one, editorial, acknowledging *want*, though denying extremity, and anticipating relief from the State; the other contains a letter signed by twenty-seven of the inhabitants of Montcalm County, indignantly denying Mr. Jacob Ferris's statement, and repudiating him as the organ of their wants. The letter is spirited and heroic. How far it is inspired by political prejudice I have no means of knowing. As Mr. Ferris has taken no pains to correct or offset these statements, although abundant time has elapsed, I can recommend no action in regard to Michigan at present.

It is plain that personal and local interests, political animosities and honest pride combined, render it difficult to discover the actual state of things in the districts referred to. It is honorable to the Western character that it so jealously defends its independence; and certainly it is most unwise to attract unnecessary attention toward the needy. But positive want among women and children is something which humanity cannot overlook, however its recognition may affect the worth of new lands, or the reputation of local climates.

Respectfully yours, HENRY W. BELLOWS.

New-York, March 11, 1859.

LETTER TO CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAMS.

To the Hon. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS, LL. D., late Chief Justice of Connecticut, and late President of the American Tract Society.

SIR: I find in *The New-York Observer* of the 29th ult., your speech delivered on the 9th ult. at the annual meeting of the Hartford Tract Society, auxiliary to the American Tract Society. The subject of this speech is of such vital interest to the Church and the world, and the matter of it is so noteworthy and important, that I need no apology for publicly addressing you in regard to it.

You undertake to defend that position of the American Tract Society on the subject of Slavery, which has been so widely and so zealously debated for a few years past, and in the course of this defense you make the following incidental admissions, showing entire willingness, both on the part of the Society and its defender, that Slavery should have an indefinite and unmolested continuance.

You tell us that "after the annual meeting of [1857] the committee were about to publish a tract on the Duties of Masters," and proceed to say that they refrained from publishing it only in consequence of remonstrances from the South. You admit that the committee were about to publish this tract, thus showing their approval of it, and their willingness to circulate it. We know, from other sources, that it had not only been approved and accepted by the committee, but that it had already been stereotyped and printed, and that, at the time of the annual meeting in 1857, it was stiched and ready for binding at the Tract House; and when, from one of those very copies, another edition was printed by another hand for the use of the public, it plainly appeared that this publication was in favor of Slavery; that the principal portions of it were written by slaveholders, and addressed to slaveholders, designing to continue such: that one prominent object of them was to advise the masters to persuade the slaves that God had authorized their subjugation and its indefinite continuance; and that they had been found so well suited to this purpose, that slaveholders had printed and re-printed them for general circulation in Virginia, Kentucky and South Carolina.

The defense of Slavery in this tract is so very unequivocal and thorough-going that I must recal to your recollection some of its sentiments and expressions.

It is made very plain for what sort of masters, and respecting what sort of servants, this tract is written. They are—"the master who holds the servant in involuntary bondage," (p. 39) and the servant who "lacks that greatest natural stimulus to exertion, the knowledge that he will himself enjoy the fruit of his labors," (p. 40.)

It is assumed that the slaveholders actually own the slaves; (pp. 16, 17, 26, 35, 42, 44, &c., &c., &c.)

It is assumed that that ownership is by God's appointment and approval; (pp. 45, 53, 59, 67, &c., &c.)

It is assumed that the claim and exercise of ownership by slaveholders over slaves is perfectly consistent with a Christian character in the former, and with the exercise of justice and Christian love toward the latter; (pp. 15, 21, 26, 30, 31, 42, &c., &c.)

It is assumed that when a master has given his slaves food, clothing, and shelter, and also a certain amount of oral religious instruction, he has obeyed the injunction of Paul—"Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal;" (p. 15.)

It is assumed that the slaveholders have a right (and that right given by God) not only to all the powers and faculties of the slaves, but to all their time, Sundays and week-days, day and night, and even to say not only when and where they shall meet, but "whether "they shall meet at all for the worship of God," (p. 16); not only to say whether they may read the Bible for themselves, but whether they may "hear it from others," (ib.).

Finally, it is assumed (by way of hint to the retailer of oral religious instruction to slaves, not to mistake as to the quantity or quality of their spiritual provender) that a collection of the passages of Scripture which enjoin upon servants obedience to masters "is the portion of spiritual food which God has de-"signed for those who are in bondage," (p. 21).

Your willing acquiescence in the unmolested and indefinite continuance of Slavery is shown not only by your mention of the above tract, as in your view, entirely unobjectionable, but by other statements, which clearly show your influence and your vote to be given for the masters, and against the slaves. For instance, you say:

"It is almost impossible to discuss the moral evils of slavery without becoming involved in the discussion of the evils of the system of slavery itself." And again—

"Had the Committee entered upon it, where should they stop? If they began to instruct masters in the duty they owed to their slaves a call would have been made for the instruction of slaves in the duty they owed to their masters! What should they say to them?"

It is very plain what the publishers of religious tracts ought to say to servants in relation to their duty to their masters, namely—to enjoin them honestly to fulfill their contract. As long as the master pays the wages which they agreed to receive, so long they are bound in honesty faithfully to discharge the service which they promised in exchange for those wages. Where there is no contract—where the man or woman who is claimed as a servant has never promised any service—it is no longer a case of master and servant, but of robber and robbed, oppressor and oppressed.

But it is this very case of which you, Judge Williams, are speaking. The master for whom, throughout this speech, you have been acting as advocate, is a robber, and one of the worst sort; a strong man, who compels a weak one permanently to labor for him, without a contract and without wages; in fact, with only provender enough to keep him in working order. Your whole speech is an attempt to defend the Tract Society for its systematic refusal to state in its tracts the claims of right, justice, humanity and religion in regard to the relation of these two parties; and this, avowedly, lest the robbers, some of whom are officers in your Society, invited speakers at its meetings, and contributors to its funds, should take umbrage!

The reasons why you side with the "trade management" and with the slaveholders in this controversy are noteworthy and instructive. You say—

"They had seen churches broken up, ministers dismissed, ecclesiastical societies divided, and the prints of the Union shaken, in the controversy which had arisen. If under such circumstances the Publishing Committee declined to engage in the conflict which related to this alienating subject, I cannot condemn them."

That is to say, in your judgment—if robbery can be stopped only by interference with those churches, ministers, ecclesiastical Societies, and political Associations which are tolerating and protecting it, it had better be allowed unmolested and indefinite continuance!

Even apart from the interests of the robbed in the decision of this question—looking only at the preëminent importance of justice in the State and of purity in the Church—though it seems ludicrous to speak of purity in connection with such churches! one would think that your decision should be reversed, and that, for their own sakes, both churches and States should hasten to purge themselves from the shameful and corrupting partnership with slaveholders in which they are now contented to remain.

I proceed to notice some of your false assumptions in regard to Slavery.

You represent that "good men," "the people of "God," "the family of the Redeemer," are divided on the point of Slavery, and that many of them favor it! You represent that the questions whether a man shall own his own body and limbs, decide the direction and receive the profits of his own labor, enjoy the society of his wife and direct the education of his children, are "minor topics," that the disregard of them is fitly parallel by the omission of "the tenth pin of the taber-"nacle"—the substitution of "a small *a* for a capital "A"—the "leaving off a word from a title-page," and that the preaching of "the fundamental truths of the "Cross" may be complete without any rebuke of the oppressor or any plea for the oppressed!

Upon all these points I take issue with you. I affirm that justice and humanity, instead of being "minor topics," are matters essential to the right establishment of a church and of a State; that the deliberate license of injustice and inhumanity practiced by our churches and States in their allowance of Slavery, instead of standing among "minor topics," is a vice of the most atrocious character; and that your expressions, above quoted, are gross libels upon Christianity—upon God, who founded it—upon Jesus, who preached it—and upon those people, the conformity of whose hearts and lives to it entitle them to be called "the people of God and the family of the Redeemer."

It is a significant fact that the "pious foreign layman, Col. Trotchin"—upon whom you bolster yourself in the classification of Liberty and Slavery among "minor topics"—also advises, and that you praise him for advising, "not to allow any mingling what-"ever of politics and the Gospel!" The bigotful depravation of our politics in this country, as the direct result of the neglect of our clergy to teach the bearings of religion upon it, is the best comment upon such anti-Christian counsel.

I pass next to some specimens of your understatement or reservation of truth.

You spoke of the American Tract Society as "carrying light and life into dark and benighted regions," and you quote a Pro-Slavery Baptist minister, the Rev. Baron Stow of Boston, as saying—"Over all "lands this Society has poured, by the press, millions "of streams of light and love."

It is by no means strange that Baron Stow should throw his influence to sustain the allies of Slavery, since only while that sin is tolerated in the churches in general, can he hope to retain the infamous provision which is printed in the pew-deeds of his own church in Boston, that they shall not be sold, except to a "respectable white person." I need take no pains to controvert the statement of one who, pretending to be a christian minister, publicly takes the position that he will call none but respectable white sinners to repentance. The "mark of the beast" is set too plainly in his forehead.

To return to your own statement, which I affirm to be a partial and imperfect one, deceptive by its reservation of important truth, my answer to it is this:

Granting that, upon some subjects, and to some places, the Tract Society has carried light and truth—I affirm that to many places, upon this momentous subject of Slavery, it has carried delusion, error and poison. It has done this in a threefold manner.

1. By the studied and uniform silence which it has preserved in regard to condemnation of Slavery in its tracts and books, though it professes to labor in the "interest of vital godliness and sound morality," and though it operates in regions where slaveholding is one of the most prominent, popular and corrupting sins. This silence, I say is a designed and efficient general complicity with this sin.

2. By a particular complicity with this sin, by the removal of passages condemning it from books and tracts which condemned other sins of the same class; whereby it was made to seem that the writers of those books and tracts did not regard slaveholding as sin. It is true that the mutilation of more publications in this way is now forbidden, but the books previously mutilated are still in circulation, constantly renewed from the old stereotype plates, for sale at the depositories, and distributed by the colporteurs.

3. By the incidental mention of Slavery as a perfectly innocent and proper relation, and such a speaking of other duties of masters and other sins of masters in that connection as plainly to imply that emancipation is not a duty, and that slaveholding is not a sin. As a specimen of these, I quote the following, from page 18 of tract No. 177, entitled "The Institution "and Observance of the Sabbath," which is for sale at the depositories both of the National Society at New-York and its auxiliary in Boston:

"In the Southern and South-Western States there are thousands who possess slaves and their children, who are both ignorant and wicked. The master is careful to teach them how to work, and see that they do their work faithfully. Should he not take some care to instruct them to the will and service of God? They make a part of his household; they stand 'within his gates,' and he daily receives the labor of their hands. Standing in this relation to them, an imperious and awfully responsible duty devolves upon him, from which he cannot exonerate himself while he holds them. Do not say with Cain 'Am I my brother's keeper?' By misfortune or choice you are become so literally, and you are so too in spiritual matters; so that if those within your gates, through your neglect, perish in their sin and ignorance, their blood will be required at your hands."

Another instance in your speech of deceptive reservation of truth is the following. You speak of the protesting minority being "aggrieved that the Society took no active part" in the cause of Freedom:

Certainly this was one of the grounds of complaint. But another, of at least equal magnitude, was the fact that, in the three ways above mentioned the Society took a passive position (which yet was a very efficient position) on the wrong side—letting the dead weight of its ponderous respectability, its "eminent gravity," rest in opposition to all the movements of reform upon that track; and that, after the annual meeting of 1856, by means of numerous circulars, bulletins, handbills, letters and newspaper articles, the government of the Society also took an active position on the wrong side, informally publishing an immense number of pretended reasons why they should not formally publish in regard to Slavery.

Again concealing an important portion of the truth, you say that "some of the executive officers, in hopes "of peace, consented to the appointment of a Com-"mittee to investigate the affairs of the Society and "report." This seems to imply that the appointment and the selection of this Committee were entirely the work of the remonstrants. In the annual report, however, for 1856, I find this materially different account of the transaction referred to.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. William Adams of New-York, a member of the Executive Committee, supported by Mr. O. E. Wood, also a member of that Committee, it was

"*Resolved*, That at the suggestion of the Executive Committee themselves, a Special Committee of Fifteen be appointed to inquire into and review the proceedings of the Executive Committee, and report to the next annual meeting, or to a duly convened special meeting to be called by said Committee at their discretion."

The next paragraph gives us the names of fifteen gentlemen who "were appointed by the President to "constitute the Committee!" This President was the Hon. Thomas S. Williams, the very person who, in the speech before us, thoroughly defends the Pro-Slavery attitude and policy of the Tract Society. Had the remonstrants nominated this Committee, would a large majority of them have been persons favoring the whole past policy of the Society? Would they have inserted in the report those clauses upon which the Executive Committee have ever since stood, as justifying a continuance of their old policy? And would they, when the whole country was anxious to hear and act upon their report, have used their "discretion" to postpone it to the annual meeting, instead of calling a special session.

The last instance which I shall mention of your understatement or reservation of truth, is the answer which you represent to be given by those who, protesting against Slavery at the North, are asked why they do not go to the South. You ask—"Will they go?"—and you reply—"No! They tell us they "should be in danger of losing their heads."

Now it is true that they would be thus endangered! It is also true that they have said so, and that this answer is one element of a full statement of their case! But it is equally true—and you know it, if you have heard the speeches or read the writings of the men whose answer you pretend to report—that this is not their first answer, nor the chiefly preponderant consideration they allege for laboring at the North instead of going to the South. You well know that they affirm their anti-Slavery labors to be needed at the North as much as at the South; and you well know the truth of the grounds of that affirmation, namely—that you, and the great majority of the members of the Tract Society, and the great majority of the clergymen and church members of every denomination, and the whole mass of the Democratic party, with a very large proportion of all the other politicians, are as much opposed to any interference with Slavery, as the slave-holders themselves; and that conversion to Anti-Slavery cannot reasonably be expected at the South, before it has taken place at the North.

Meanwhile, it is instructive to note your tacit concession of the truth of so much of the answer of the Anti-Slavery people as you have undertaken to report—that your friends at the South, the supporters of the Tract Society there, would cut off the heads of Abolitionists if they had them in their power, and to mark this corroboration of the threat made at the last annual meeting of the Tract Society, by the Rev. H. M. Denison, Rector of an Episcopal Church in Charleston, South-Carolina. These are his words, as quoted in *The Independent*, in relation to the circulation at the South of a tract which represented slaveholding as sin:

"He would say that the emissaries who brought it would have done so at the risk of their necks. Self-preservation demanded of them, whether Christians or not, when a man presented himself at their doors with such a missile as that, to send him away, and if he would not go by request he should go by violence.

"A Voice—It is a free country, is it not. Mr. Denison?

"Mr. D.—We would show him very soon whether it is free down there!"

I must next notice some instances of your positive misstatements or reversals of truth:

Speaking of the complaints against the Tract Society, you say—

"If objections were made, it was *not on account of what they did*, but on account of what they did not do."

So absolutely and directly false is the italicised portion of the above statement, that one of the earliest and most strongly urged complaints against the Society was its mutilation of religious books and tracts, an expunging and suppressing, by its Publishing Committee, of what pious men and women had written against Slavery. Even supposing it possible that you had not seen the published letter of Judge Jay to that very Committee of Fifteen which you selected and appointed—and the published "Unanimous Remon-"strance of the Fourth Congregational Church, Hart-"ford, Conn., against the policy of the American "Tract Society on the subject of Slavery"—you necessarily knew that the report of the Committee of Fifteen, unanimously adopted by the Society in 1857, contained a resolution expressly prohibiting further mutilations.

Another positive thing done by the Tract Society, and frequently complained of, is the occasional incidental mention of Slavery in their tracts as an indifferent thing, thus implying its propriety and innocence while they were actively condemning practices venial in comparison. Instances of this are found in the tract "Sambo and Tony," and in the tract on the Sabbath from which I have made a quotation above.

Another charge of positive evil-doing against the Tract Society has alleged, and proved, deliberate and oft-repeated falsehood on the part of the Executive Committee, in their official documents, in regard to the constitutional basis of the Society's operations.

That constitutional basis says, in its first Article, that the tracts circulated by the Society must be "calculated to receive the approbation of all Evan-"gelical Christians."

The Executive Committee have many times affirmed the obvious untruth that this clause imposes the yet further restriction on the tracts issued, "that they be "such only as Evangelical Christians throughout our "country do in fact unitedly approving." This statement may be found on page 193 of the Annual Report for 1856. In the same document, page 197, is the following repetition of the same idea:

"To this line of distinction the Publishing Committee may go, but no further. It is not for them to decide what Evangelical Christians ought to agree in, on controverted points, but what they are agreed in."

To these directly false statements are affixed, page 200, the signatures of the whole Government of the Society, twenty-one persons, from Thomas S. Williams, President, down to R. S. Cook, Corresponding Secretary; and you individually repeat the same untruth in the very speech I am now reviewing, saying of the Society, "Its issues must be such as will meet "the approbation of all Evangelical Christians."

Moreover, in the document immediately following this, p. 202 of the same Annual Report, are the following question and answer, signed by John Knox, then one of the Publishing Committee, and Wm. A. Hallock, one of the Corresponding Secretaries:

"But has not the Society published, on intemperance and other evils, what many Evangelical Christians do not approve?

"It has not, so far as we know."

The audacity of this falsehood, considering that the Society's tracts have pointedly condemned the use of wine and tobacco, the practice of dancing, even in the domestic circle, the reading of novels, and the using of any part of Sunday for walks of recreation, or for reading or writing on subjects not technically religious—in regard to the propriety of every one of which evangelical Christians undoubtedly differ, both in theory and practice—is nothing less than amazing.

I proceed to quote one other of your mis-statements or reversals of truth in the speech now under consideration. You say, near its close, "The real question "involved was, shall we now recall our colporteurs, "and cease to distribute tracts at the South?"

You know perfectly well, Judge Williams, that this was not the real quest on involved. You know perfectly well that nobody had asked the Tract Society, and that no necessity would have been laid upon them, even had they published "the suppressed tract," and "the rejected tract" also, to recall a single colporteur from any part of their field, or to cease to distribute their tracts. The only question was, whether so many of the tracts would have been accepted and read, as previously. My individual opinion is that many more than before would have been called for, and that the curiosity which was felt all over the country to see what the Tract Society would do in regard to Slavery would have caused an unprecedented demand for their issues upon this sub