THE PENDING CANVASS.

NEW-YORK.

SPEECH OF THE HON. DENNIS M'CARTHY.

At a recent Mass Meeting in Syracuse, the Hon. Roscoe Conkling and Dennis McCarthy, Republican candidate for Congress, delivered telling addresses. We give the following extracts from Mr. McCarthy's speech:

As for myself, I confess that I believe in the right of every man at the South, who can read and write, who has served the Union cause, who has shown himself capable of discriminating between treacherous traitors and loyal men, to inscribe upon the National records his vote as freely as every other man in the country. [Great applause.] We talk of the necessity of education at the South. I tell you that there is nothing in the world that serves so quickly to elevate a race, to elevate it from the low standard of Slavery to the higher sphere of honorable manhood as to give it the right to vote. How has this principle of universal suffrage advanced? Only a few years ago men thought that property would be unsafe, and feared that bad laws would be enacted in the country if we struck out of our Constitutions the property qualification. But we did it. Every honest man, whether poor or rich, intelligent or not, became a voter in this State; and we have yet to learn that a single act has yet been passed upon the statute-books of New-York showing that there was any injury to either property, life or liberty in a white franchise. Then again, we had a class of people in this country who proclaimed and believed—some do so still, honestly—that an adopted citizen, unless he had dived 21 years in this country, should not vote; that their ballots were dangerous to our country. I thank God that the examination of the laws of the country, both of the State and nation, prove the fact that not one single act has been put on record showing damage or injury received from the adopted citizen's vote. We are too apt to magnify the evils of universal suffrage; we are too conservative sometimes about this great republican principle. How is it with Prussia—monarchical Prussia? She has just proclaimed universal suffrage in Northern Germany. Every man 25 years old can vote. Thus a European monarchy puts to shame the conservatives of a Republic. You need not fear that in the end the South will not accept everyclause of the Amendment. I think this thing will operate very much in accordance with a little affair which took place in Prussia in the days of the shrewd Frederick the Great. At that time no person could be buried without Christian rites and religious services. But it happened that a man died; his friends took his body to the church, up to the altar, and called for the priest, but he refuses to say service or perform religious rites over the body, because the deceased had neglected to pay his church dues. The relatives were in consternation. The body must be above ground, it could not be buried without the proper ceremony. Finally, the mourners went to Frederick the Great and asked him what they should do about it. "Do?" said he, "why, walk away and leave the body before the altar; and before many hours you will see that the priest will bury it himself, without any rites!" [Applause and laughter.] And so it is with these Southern States; they are in an anomalous, chaotic condition; it is for their interest to come back into the Union. They gain nothing by staying out. If they delay, the terms will be more severe for their entrance. Let them alone and they will soon see this. They will accept the Amendment and of their own accord will bury the dead and rotten body of the Rebellion out of sight. By the Amendment we take them by the hand and lift them upon the platform of the Nation, side by side with ourselves. We put our arms around them; we clasp them as brother clasps brother, and say, "You shall have the liberties, the laws, the Constitution which we have, neither more nor less." If this be not generously, honorably and high-minded, then I mistake what is high-minded and honorable. Shall I relate to you in this connection what a Southern gentleman said to me only two months ago? "Do you think I to Judge Chisholm of Petersburg, Va., who was a member of the Confederate Congress, "do you acknowledge that the proclamation of Abraham Lincoln was a Constitutional act?" "Never! Never!" was his reply; "it was unconstitutional, and the day may come when we shall demand pay for the slaves you took away from us in an unconstitutional manner." "Do you believe, Judge?" I asked, "that the doctrine of secession is wrong?" "No, Sir; you conquered us, you subdued us; we sank under the weight of your arms, but the political principles of our hearts you can never conquer; they are the same to-day as when we commenced the Rebellion." This is the general sentiment of the South. And it will only be through the overpowering influence, the overwhelming will of the North, that the Southerners will ever give up these principles and hopes. Andrew Johnson has done more to revive this rebellious spirit, to make this trouble and contention, against which we are now contending, than the most traitorous man the South has ever produced. I think Heaven, too, that compromises upon great principles are among things of the past. [Applause, and cries of "Yes, Yes."] We stand upon the "Declaration of Independence," upon its great doctrine that "all men are created free and equal" in the sight of their God, and are entitled to equal protection in life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. [Applause.] And if upon these broad principles we must go down, we shall submit to our fate as men actuated by sentiments of honor and obedience to the law, not like the Rebels, who attempt to overturn and destroy the Republic! When the time shall come, when our own country is at peace, we intend, individually, like the streams which flow from the mountains, which connect with the rivers at the base of the mountains, and form a mighty river, which rushes to the ocean, we intend to band together with our moral force and our pecuniary means, to aid the people of Ireland in maintaining their rights. [Great applause.] And not only the people of Ireland, but the people of every country upon the civilized earth who demand to be liberated and freed from monarchy and from oppression. Then we shall go forward in our mission of conquering and driving despotism everywhere from the face of the earth.

A POSTMASTER'S OPINION OF THE RECORD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The Hon. A. X. Parker, Postmaster at Potsdam, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., an office worth $3,000 a year, sent a letter to Postmaster-General Randall, from which we extract this passage:

"The Democratic party was false to its history, false to its duties, false to the American people, and to the human race. It wantonly and brutally threw its vast weight upon a weak and defenceless people, struggling into manhood. It created, organized and sustained the Rebellion. It became degraded, defeated and disgraced. Its followers are even now seeking to escape the infamy that envelops them as a cloud, by flourishing a new banner, and answering to a strange name. It bears the curse of thousands upon thousands of the slain, and is hated and detested by loyal millions. The grave will not cover it, oblivion cannot hide it, mankind will not forget it. It is the political Gehenna of the world."

MASSACHUSETTS.

GEN. BANKS ON THE NEW-ORLEANS MASSACRE AND THE FREE-STATE CONVENTION.

Gen. Banks delivered an exhaustive speech at Charlestown, Mass., on the 8th, from which we extract:

Look at what has transpired in Memphis. Look at what has transpired in many of the States and the parishes in all the Southern States. Look at that terrible massacre in New-Orleans. I know the country perfectly well. I know who were engaged in it. I say what I said in Washington over my own signature: There never were better or purer patriots, or men more devoted to liberty, than those massacred in New-Orleans. In 1863 Mr. Lincoln desired a government to be formed in the State of Louisiana. It was formed by loyal men, excluding the enemies of the country. They elected officers by a popular vote representing then the full strength of the loyal sentiment of the State at that time. They gave 12,000 votes, and in the election of 1864, on the 22d of February, after the Rebels had recovered with all their powers and in all the parishes to participate in the election, the entire vote of the State of Louisiana was only 27,000. They gave in the city of New-Orleans 7,000 votes. They made a Constitution, and Mr. Lincoln said to Judge Durell, in speaking of the constitution of Louisiana, that he had read that instrument three times, word for word, and although it embraced some principles that were novel in constitutional history, he believed it his duty to say that he thought it the most perfect instrument that had been framed in the Union. A new principle had been introduced in that instrument, according to the judgment of Mr. Lincoln, was the recognition of the rights of labor as an institution of government, entitled to its protection and its favor. [Applause.] Among other provisions or acts of the Convention that framed the constitution, it was declared that when the whole State was represented or within the lines of the army (about one half of the parishes only being represented in 1864) when the whole State should be within the lines of the army, a new election should be called, or the parishes not represented should be privileged to a representation in the same Convention, and if there were any amendments to be proposed that they should have the privilege of proposing them. That was not only proper, not only just, but it was necessary; and in 1865 they got in process of execution that ordinance of the Convention that framed the Constitution. What did they propose to do? To usurp powers, as the President not said? Not at all. To overturn the Government? Not at all. What did they propose to do? Nothing but to call an election of delegates in the parishes which had not been represented in that Convention, and that election was to be 30 or 60 days hence. It was a competent for the people of Louisiana to say they would participate in that election, or for the Government of the United States to say the election should not be held, but that was the whole proposition that the people of Louisiana, in 30 or 60 days, when the Governor should issue writs, should hold an election in the parishes where no representatives have been chosen, that thereafter the Convention would sit and make changes as the case might be, and if changes were made they would be submitted to the people for confirmation or rejection, as the Constitution itself had been. Was there anything wrong in this? Is there a man here who will say that the people of Louisiana had not the right to do that? Considering the fact that one-half the parishes of the State had been excluded from the Convention which made the Constitution, it was thought perfectly just, as well as necessary, that they should have the right of representation. What does the President do? Gov. Wells had been elected Governor by the people, and he had been recognized by the President. From being a man very radical, he had become a man quite in love with the Rebels, and had appointed nearly all of them to offices in the different parishes. In the parish of Terre Bonne, where he had displaced Union men and given place to Rebels, public opinion was so strong that the Rebels for more than four months could not take their offices, and by power outside of Louisiana, the men were finally put in possession of the places to which they had been appointed. But Gov. Wells saw the exclusion of Union men from political power and the introduction of enemies to power was fatal, and he wisely therefore changed his course again. He adopted the policy of the Union men and favored the election of delegates to revise the Constitution if they should admit it to be necessary when they were elected, and so prepared to issue writs of election for that purpose. The Rebels appealed to the President. They did not dare to submit this question to the public opinion of that State. They did not dare to take the vote of the people upon that question. *What did the President do when the Rebels appealed to him to upset this business? Did he go to Gov. Wells and say: "You are wrong and must stop!" Did he give him any instructions?* He asked him what authority he had for calling an election. Gov. Wells replied that he had exercised only that power which the ordinance gave to the Convention—that he did not initiate it himself—that he was simply issuing write of election. Then the President of the United States passes by the Governor whom he had recognized and goes *to the Lieutenant-Governor who was a Rebel Chief Justice, captured by our armies during the war and held a prisoner of war for nearly two years in New-Orleans*, and never allowed the right to participate in the affairs of the Government, or to control opinion in any way whatever—the President goes to this Rebel Chief Justice, Voorhees, made Lieutenant-Governor by the votes of Rebels, and consults him and gives him instructions what to do. *And the next officer in command was another Rebel, a general in the Rebel army, made the Attorney-General without any executive authority whatever*—and he is in consultation with the President. I do not complain of this. That may all be right enough, if the process and the result be right. But what was the result? Let me tell you this, fellow-citizens. *If the President, or Gen. Sheridan, or any man in the authority of the United States had said to the Union men of Louisiana, "Suspend your Convention,"—"Do not press this question at this time," there was no one man, I say, who would not have yielded to that suggestion and that request.* I know them well, and I will stake my life here or anywhere upon it. If such a suggestion had been made by any one representing the Government, no such matter as this convention or election would have been pressed by the Union men. But it was never meant. The President had communicated with the Rebel Lieut-Governor and the Rebel Attorney-General. Their communications were not known. The Union men were left to think they would be permitted to hold their convention and their election without disturbance, and that ultimately, if anything was done, the whole would be submitted to the people for confirmation or rejection. They were kept in this belief until the very day, and hour, and moment when their convention was called. Then they found the hall surrounded by more than 600 special policemen, every one of whom was a Rebel soldier or Rebel officer, all of whom were armed. And these men passed into that Convention, and with the arms in their hands shot down the unoffending, and innocent and unarmed men. And they did it as they thought with the authority of the Government of the United States. I know the Rev. Mr. Horton, who served as chaplain of the Convention, perfectly well. No purer man ever graced that sacred calling than that gentleman. He was there without any interest in the political affairs of that day. He was there to address the throne of God and to ask that if error blinded the eyes of any men connected with the affairs of this country, God Almighty would remove the scale and give him to do aright, honestly and justly. He left his wife, saying he would be back in half an hour. He was not engaged more than half an hour in attending to this call, and when he emerged he was met by these special police—Rebels in disguise, asking and thirsting for his blood, and with the robes of his office upon him he was shot down in cold blood. Beslie, too, I knew perfectly well, and as I have said elsewhere, no country or age ever gave birth to a purer man, or more conspicuous or deserving patriot, the man in whose courage and enthusiasm the organization had been brought to the point where it was, although not a member of the convention. He was singled out, and by as many wounds as Cæsar bore at the feet of Pompey's statue, Beslie fell in death, and was thrown with negroes into a cart and carried off we know not where. Gov. Wells says 200 or 400 men, white and black, were wounded or murdered in this massacre. Why was this? Why was it that this fraud, this violence, this force, this massacre was resorted to by these men who pretended to represent the United States, and who were in constant communication with the President. It was because they did not dare appeal to public opinion. They knew perfectly well if their purposes were to be carried out they were to be carried out as aristocrats carry out their purposes everywhere in all time, by fraud, force and violence. They took that course and the result was as has been seen. You will see it every where. I will not say, because I may be contradicted, that no man from the North will be permitted to go into the Southern States and to express his opinion; but I tell you what I know, *that any man of this country who goes into that portion of the country with his capital or skill or ideas or knowledge, with a view to take from them their political power, will meet his death*, because they do not intend to give up that political power to any arbitration of public opinion there or here. They cannot do it. They cannot afford it. Aristocrats never recognize public opinion. It is not in the nature of the animal. [Applause.]

OHIO.

GEN. BUTLER'S CINCINNATI SPEECH.

Gen. Butler's argument to show the grounds and necessity of Andrew Johnson's impeachment, delivered in Cincinnati October 6, specifies his attacks upon Congress and denial of its authority, his corrupt use of the power of appointment, his declaration of peace without the consent of the Congress, abuse of the pardoning power, refusal to execute the laws, and complicity in the New-Orleans massacre, as among his violations of the Constitution. The conclusion of his speech is as follows:

Without, then, waiting until the President of the United States shall commit any other overt act of mischief to the Government of the United States, has there not been stated here a sufficient number of violations, plain, palpable and direct in the judgment of the people, for which he can be impeached? [A voice, "Yes."] The difficulty is this: A court of impeachment sets only when the true sense of the people is outraged. The question must, first of all, be submitted to the people, and, last of all, it must be submitted to the people. It is for the people to demand of their Congress that justice shall be administered to the President of the United States, or it cannot be done. I have been asked this question: "How can the President be impeached?" He is Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, and the Constitution of the United States says nothing whatever about who shall hold the office while he is being impeached. Therefore, if you commence an impeachment he will order the army and navy to disperse Congress, and will seize the reins of Government. How is the remedy to be applied? The House of Representatives, under the Constitution, is the grand inquest of the nation—perhaps I might say, for illustration, the *grand* jury of the nation. It prepares a bill of impeachment against the President if it sees cause, and presents that bill of impeachment to the Senate of the United States, which then becomes a high court of impeachment, and the Chief-Justice of the United States sits in that court as its presiding officer. It is thus no longer for that purpose the Senate of the United States, but is the High Court of Impeachment of the United States. What may it do? When the bill is found the Senate sends out its messenger or sergeant-at-arms to bring in the criminal, be he high or low. [Applause.] They set him at the bar and read the bill to him. If he pleads guilty, then they proceed to sentence him, which sentence is deposition and deprivation of office. When he is brought before the bar and pleads not guilty the Senate of the United States may order him to be imprisoned, or to find bail, or make any other proper order that a court might adopt in a criminal case. When the Constitution provided this mode of trial did its framers mean that a man who is before the Court of Impeachment as a criminal shall be at the same time the chief executive officer of the Government? By no means. From that moment he ceases to be able to exercise the duties of that office until he is acquitted. And thus comes one case of inability of the President of the United States to exercise the office of President; so the Vice-President must take the office, and, there being now no Vice-President, it must devolve on the President of the Senate for the time being. [Applause.] If in any of these steps so taken, according to the Constitution, the President does not obey, as a good citizen, the behests of the High Court of Impeachment, then that court, like any other court in the land, can call upon the whole power of the body of the people to aid it in enforcing its rightful authority. [Applause.] And I now serve a notice on Andrew Johnson that when a rightful, constitutional court of the United States calls for aid in their behalf on the people of the United States, the Boys in Blue will answer. [Great applause.] We are told that if Congress shall proceed to exercise this their rightful authority that there will be tried the strength of this Government; that the President will call upon the army and navy, and the army and navy will obey him. Let there be no fear about that, because the army and navy of the United States are not those few men who are in the regular service. I have no desire to disparage either the patriotism or the integrity of the army of the United States, but if the army, as such, or any portion of it, or any officer of it, shall so far forget the duties he owes to his flag, and to his profession as a soldier, as to answer any but the legal call of his country, that small body of men will be swept from the face of the country as a cobweb is swept away before the rising of the morning sun. [Applause.] More than that, we are told that this will be a struggle. Very well. I am convinced of one of two things—either that the struggle, if it shall come at all, must come in this way, or it will be precipitated upon us in the next Presidential election, when we come to inaugurate our President—when the States still in rebellion, if they shall not have accepted the terms of Congress to come back, will endeavor by aid of their sympathizers North to foist upon the Northern States a President of their choice; and in such a case it might not be so clear where exactly was the legal right. If I am correct in my statement of the law of impeachment and the form of trial, we shall have the right and forms of law. If rights are clear, and if trouble must come, which God forbid, let it come in March, 1867, not in March, 1868. Let us have this thing done with. This country has been in turmoil and trouble and difficulty and commotion long enough from traitors and their sympathizers. [Great applause.] Let us settle this question now, at once and forever. If Baal be God, let us serve him—if the Lord God be God, let us serve Him, and then an end. [Great cheers.]

WISCONSIN.

THE DISCUSSION BETWEEN SENATORS DOOLITTLE AND HOWE—A REMARKABLE DIALOGUE.

From The Milwaukee Sentinel.

We learn from parties who were present that in the discussion between our two Senators on Thursday, at the Kenosha County Fair, Senator Doolittle was fairly and completely defeated.

Speaking of interruptions, one or two incidents occurred that are worthy of record. While Mr. Doolittle was discoursing of the loyalty of the South, some one in the crowd called out "New-Orleans." The Senator was greatly angered at this, and called out: "Who was that? Get up and show yourself!" Whereupon a young man in the audience got up and showed himself conspicuously, and declared that he was the man. Doolittle shouted, "What is your name, Sir?" The prompt and emphatic reply was: "My name is Smith, and I served four years in the army, *fighting just such men as you are!*"

In the course of the speech the following dialogue was held between the speaker and an intelligent old gentleman named Gleason. The Senator was, we think, speaking of his own consistency, and charging the Republican party with deserting him, when the dialogue opened:

Gleason—"I pronounce you, Sir, a traitor to liberty!"

Doolittle—"You villainous, gray haired old man, do you dare come here and insult me in this way, after I have been invited here to address the people?" (This was spoken in a very offensive manner, as though addressed to a servant.)

Gleason—"I am not talking to my master, but to one of the servants of the American people. *I pronounce you a traitor to liberty!*"

Doolittle—"I have sacrificed more in this war than you."

Gleason—"No you haven't!"

Doolittle—"Yes I have!"

Gleason—"No you haven't!"

Doolittle—"I have given a son to the country."

Gleason—"And I have given two sons to the country!"

Doolittle—"But are your sons dead, sir?"

Gleason—"No; thank God, they came out of the war alive."

Doolittle—"But my son is dead!"

Gleason—"Well, sir, it is a blessing to him that he is dead, *and has not survived to witness the shame of his father!*"

SPEECH OF GEN. H. E. PAINE.

Gen. Halbert E. Paine, in a speech at Kenosha, Oct. 4, after a searching review of Senator Doolittle's cause, showing how opposite were his opinions, up to 1865, to those he holds now, concluded with the following apt illustration:

It has been said that if Mohammed and the mountain would come together, the mountain will not come to Mohammed, but Mohammed must go to the mountain. All this has been reversed by the genius of our illustrious Senator. He commences political life a Democrat in New-York. This is his first known position. In the days of the Barnburners Mohammed stands up, and the mountain of Democracy walks away from him, and he is a Barnburner. But he has not changed. In 1852 the Democratic mountain moves up to him again. Behold he is a Democrat once more! But he has not changed. In 1856 the Democratic mountain marches off again. Behold Mohammed is a Republican! But he has not changed. And now in 1866 the Republican party has straggled away from the great magician, and Democracy under a new name is at his side again, and Mohammed is—what shall I say? A National Union Democratic Republican Bread-and-Butter Johnson man. Now, is all this fact, or is it a mere fantasy of the honorable Senator? We have seen him a Barnburner once, a Republican once, a Democrat twice, and now he is a Johnson man. Have the mountains really danced back and forth in his presence? or has he danced back and forth between the mountains? When he tells us that the great Union party has drifted away from him, has he not made the same mistake which the overman made when bending his eyes down to the stern of his little craft he fancied the rock-bound coast was reeling past him. Lifting up his eyes upon the lofty spires and cloud-capped mountains, he was happy to find that it was his little oysterboat that had changed position and not the solid earth. God grant that the distinguished Senator may change once more, and only once more, and that he may struggle with as much real and ability to save the Republic as he now shows in his efforts for its ruin.

SPEECH OF THE HON. MATT. CARPENTER.

The Hon. M. N. Carpenter, in an elaborate speech in Milwaukee last week, thus presented the issue between Congress and the President:

Senator Doolittle and the politicians who side with the President are laboring to conceal the real issue and present a false one. It is not the question whether these States are to be kept out of the Union, to be governed as conquered provinces that now separates Congress and the President. No one is or ever has been in favor of any such thing. But of Congress is in favor of any such thing. But the real question is which branch of the General Government has the right to take steps toward reconstructing such Governments, and to fix the terms and impose the conditions upon which they shall be received into membership as States. It is too late for the President or his friends to claim that no conditions ought to be imposed; for, during several months after the surrender of Lee and Johnston, the President and his Secretary of State did little else than declare to these Southern State Governments what Constitutional amendments they must ratify, and what provisions engraft upon their own Constitutions before they would be recognized as in the Union. But now the President virtually says these States having complied with his demands, having understood his dictation, ratified the amendment abolishing Slavery, and having repudiated the Rebel war debt, he is satisfied; and Congress has no right to name any additional conditions. The misfortune of Senator Doolittle's speeches is, that he is not only compelled to differ with Congress, but his entire argument, if it is good for anything, breaks the President with the most flagrant invasion of the rights of these States. If they were in the Union, and of right entitled to representation, as soon as the Rebellion was suppressed, how can the President and his Secretary of State be justified in all their letters and dispatches to these States, during the year 1865, prescribing conditions—the abolition of Slavery and the repudiation of the Rebel war debt? They were then, upon this theory, as great usurpers as Congress is now. The fact is the Executive set the example, whether it be good or bad, of imposing conditions upon these States, and the further fact is, as I shall next attempt to show, that the President acted in this direction without any authority, and by clear and high-handed usurpation.

RELIGIOUS.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF UNITARIANS.

FIRST DAY.

From Our Special Correspondent.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., Oct. 9, 1866.

The second National Conference of the Unitarian denomination convened at the Church of the Messiah, in this city, this evening. During the preceding day and night every train arriving from the East and West brought numbers of ministers and delegates from the societies of that faith in various parts of the country, and, at the present hour of writing, every hotel in the town is crowded with guests, while the hospitality of the Unitarians of Syracuse, and even that of other denominations, to some extent, is heavily tarred for the adequate accommodation of their visiting brethren. The Unitarians number in their body many eminent men, "and of honorable women not a few;" and these are largely represented in the body whose annual meeting has just commenced.

The spectacle presented to the observer in the church this evening was truly a fine one. The building, itself a handsome affair, was profusely decorated with elegant flowers and evergreens, and the audience, which was somewhat crowded, comprised many venerable heads and very many intellectual faces, the effect of the whole, brilliantly lighted, can with difficulty be appreciated by those not present to enjoy. Among the delegates are the Hon. T. D. Eliot, M. C., of Massachusetts, ex-Gov. Andrew of Massachusetts, ex-Gov. Goodwin of New-Hampshire, ex-Gov. Map of Michigan, President Hosmer of Antioch College, Ohio, the Hon. G. Twichell of Massachusetts, Judge Underwood of Virginia, the Hon. John E. Williams of New-York, Judge Pirtle of Louisville, the Hon. Artemas Carter of Chicago, the Rev. Drs. Bellows and Osgood of New-York, the Rev. Dr. Collier of Chicago, the Rev. Drs. Gannett, Clarke Stebbins, Hale, Stearns and Newell of Massachusetts, the Rev. Drs. Palfrey, Sheldon and Wheeler of Maine, the Rev. Dr. Eliot of St. Louis, the Rev. Dr. Furness of Philadelphia, &c.

At the conclusion of the sermon the Rev. Samuel J. May of Syracuse made some announcements concerning the order of business for the Conference, and after the singing of a hymn by the whole congregation, with marvelous effect, the benediction was pronounced and the meeting dispersed. The Conference proper meets at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, and in case ex-Gov. Andrew fails to arrive in season, the chair will probably be taken by the Hon. Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts.

SECOND DAY.

SYRACUSE, Oct. 10, 1866.

At 10 o'clock a. m. the Hon. Ichabod Goodwin, Ex-Governor of New-Hampshire, and Vice-President of the National Unitarian Conference, called the delegates to order, and made a brief address congratulating the audience on the favorable circumstances under which they were met together, and counseling harmony in all deliberations and work.

The Rev. Edward E. Hale of Boston, Secretary of the Conference, reported that he had received the credentials of delegates representing 136 religious societies, and nine missionary organizations.

The Rev. H. W. Bellows, D. D. of New-York, Chairman of the Council of the Conference, submitted the Annual Report of that body. After a review of the religious field, and a statement of the causes bringing the present organization of the Unitarians into existence, the report said that the plans of the Council had been carried out as follows: 1. The sum of $130,000 was raised for denominational purposes, in 1865. 2. The further sum of $100,000 was sought to be raised in 1866, and $40,000 toward it is already in hand. 3. There has been raised $100,000 for Antioch College, and provision has been made for other supplies, amounting in all to about $200,000 for the Institution. 4. The subject of endowing Theological Schools is yet under advisement, as the favorable time therefor has not yet been decided. 5. The subject of establishing an organ of the sect is yet undetermined upon. The present papers are good, and there is a probability that *The Christian Inquirer* will soon pass into hands which will make it still better. 6. Missionary work has ever been fostered, and made the subject of special thought and care. The Council has met six times, and has held frequent consultations. There is cordial harmony between the Conference and all other denominational organizations. The Council think the Conference meets the wishes of the denomination as an instrumentality for promoting religion, but also hold that there is needed a more thorough and effective organization in respect of the details of carrying on its work.

The Rev. Francis E. Abbott of Dover, N. H., introduced the following, which he proposed as a substitute for the preamble and Article I. of the Constitution of the Conference:

Whereas, The object of Christianity is the universal diffusion of love, righteousness and truth, and the attainment of this object depends, under God, upon individual and collective Christian activity, and collective Christian activity, to be efficient, must be thoroughly organized; and

Whereas, Perfect freedom of thought, which is at once the right and the condition of every human being, always leads to diversity of opinion, and is therefore hindered by common creeds or statements of faith; and

Whereas, The only reconciliation of the duties of collective Christian activity and individual freedom of thought, lies in an efficient organization for practical Christian work, based rather on unity of spirit than on unity of belief.

ARTICLE I.—Therefore the churches here assembled, disregarding all sectarian or theological differences, and offering a cordial fellowship to all who will join with them in Christian work, unite themselves in a common body, to be known as The National Conference of Unitarian and Independent Churches.

The preamble and resolution were ordered to be referred to the Business Committee.

The Rev. Mr. Heywood of Louisville, from the Committee on Nominations, now reported as follows: For President, the Hon. Thomas D. Eliot of Massachusetts; for Vice-Presidents, the Hon. James Speed of Kentucky, the Hon. Charles S. May of Michigan, the Hon. George Partridge of Missouri, the Hon. John Wells of Massachusetts, Gen. M. F. Force of Ohio, and Gen. Ambrose E. Burnside of Rhode Island; for Honorary Secretary, the Rev. Augustus Woolbury of Providence; for Recording Secretary, the Rev. R. L. Collier, D.D., of Chicago; for Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. George H. Hepworth of Boston; for Members of the Council, the Rev. H. W. Bellows, D.D., the Hon. Artemas Carter, the Rev. J. F. Clarke, D.D., the Rev. Charles Lowe, the Hon. Warren Sawyer, the Rev. A. D. Mayo, the Hon. C. S. May, Charles E. Guild, esq., the Rev. Edward E. Hale and Hon. O. G. Steele.

These nominations were ratified with applause.

The Rev. Mr. Heywood of Louisville presented a memorial from the Western Unitarian Conference, urging the need of a better organization of the body. The memorial eulogized Wm. E. Channing, Hosea Ballou, and Barton W. Stone, as the leaders and founders of three great religious movements (Unitarian, Universalist, and "Christian" respectively), all whose tendencies were in the same direction. The memorial referred in glowing terms to the liberal faith as worth laboring for, and suggested means of more effectually carrying on its work by organization of every practicable kind, and thereby greatly extending the scope of operations. A plan accompanying the memorial was submitted therewith. It contemplated the formation of church, neighborhood, and district conferences, all tributary to the general conference, with all useful methods carefully defined, also the establishment of jurisdiction over supply, and the candidating of ministry in the church; the establishment of a publishing house, and the preparation of a book of worship with other denominational furniture.

The Rev. Dr. Clarke of Boston presented the report of a Committee appointed at the last Conference to consider the subject of a more general cooperation among liberal Christians of various names, in advancing the general cause. Nothing definite has been done, but the Committee submitted as the result of deliberation on the subject, the following four possible methods: 1. The adoption of a creed, and a union of the Conservative Unitarian with the Liberal Orthodox. 2. The continuance of existing methods. 3. The broadening the present platform to admit "independent" believers to it; and 4. The destruction of the denominational character of the Conference, and the establishment of an independent religious movement. The report recommended the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution, so as that the Conference may be composed of delegates from Unitarian churches "and other Christian churches."

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The proposition of the Rev. Mr. Abbott for amending the Constitution came up by assignment, and the Rev. Dr. Hedge took the floor in opposition. He pronounced the plan premature, having only the experience of one year to refer to or improve upon. The present Constitution may be imperfect, but it is perhaps, all in all, as good as can be devised. If the young men of the denomination cannot remain with us under the present Constitution, it is better that they go away from us than for a change to be now made of the character indicated, and as the alternative may seem, "Independent" may mean and include Mohammedanism, Mormonism, and Atheism, and with none of these could the speaker fellowship.

The Rev. C. H. Burleigh, Minister of an Independent religious society at Florence, Mass., presented in a very forcible manner the claims of the persons represented by him to consideration by the Conference.

The Rev. Mr. Fox of Trenton, N. Y., one of the youngest men in the denomination, expressed himself as decidedly opposed to the change sought to be made, and would draw the denominational bands tighter, rather than loosen them.

The Rev. Dr. Bellows followed in a speech of great power. He was opposed to the change because it was a radical one, not demanded by the exigencies, real or supposed, of the body. He was opposed to it on the grounds both of expediency and conviction. The new plan gives up the essence of Christianity which the old embodies. Duty, therefore, to Christ and to himself forbid his assent to it. He was a member of the church universal, but was yet a Unitarian, and he fully believed in the establishment of denominational boundaries as an efficient means of usefulness. He would not take on board passengers until it shall have been demonstrated, as it has not yet been, that we can row our own boat creditably. He said he could never see the flag of Christ lowered, or the Head of the Church degraded, nor connive thereat; and from any denomination wherein such a proceeding shall become a fact he should at once secede.

The Rev. Mr. Mayo of Cincinnati opposed the amendment in a fine address.

Gov. Padelford of Rhode Island moved to indefinitely postpone the entire subject; but withdrew his motion on being informed that such motion would cut off debate.

The Rev. Mr. Abbott, the mover of the amendment, spoke for the radicals, most of whom are young men. He wanted no creed, nor anything in the resemblance of it. He believed in Christian work, but also in perfect freedom of thought, and held that in the unity of the spirit full scope can be given to the intellects while the soul suffers no molestation. Unless a union can be effected on the doctrine of spiritual unity, many of the young men of the sect will feel compelled to leave it, and seek for a spiritual home elsewhere. He warmly appealed to the Conference to make it possible for all to work together.

The Rev. Charles Noyes of Northfield, Mass., hoped some means might be devised to effect a resolution of the subject in such a manner as that both wings of the denomination should be satisfied, and offered an amendment prepared with that result in view. The amendment was not seconded.

The Rev. Dr. Osgood of New-York was content to allow affairs to remain as they now are, and considered the Constitution abundantly liberal and comprehensive. It was fairly adopted only one year ago, after a long debate, and has since been found to command respect. No work of the spirit in which the "word" has joined can stand the test of experience, and into all Christian endeavor Christ the word, the son of the living God must enter and be cherished.

The Rev. G. W. Stimson, Dean of the University body, spoke great words for the Conference, and advocated the cause of the Lord and Messiah, Jesus Christ.

The Rev. R. C. Fowle reviewed some of the arguments made against the proposition of Mr. Abbott, and made an eloquent appeal in its favor. He read letters received by him from Mr. C. E. Norton, the Rev. Dr. Bartol, and others, sustaining his view of the matter.

The Rev. Dr. Clarke, in an argumentative and logical address, appealed to the reason of the radical members of the body to stay their hands in the work they had undertaken.

The Rev. Mr. Shippen of Worcester, Mass., spoke briefly against the amendment.

The Rev. Robert Collyer of Chicago reprehended the Rev. Dr. Bellows for having broached the idea of his possible secession from the body in any case. He expressed sympathy with young men and progressive men; but was constrained to withhold his assent to the proposal before the Conference.

The Rev. Rufus Ellis of Boston followed in a very conservative speech, and was in turn succeeded by the Rev. Mr. May of Syracuse, who endeavored to pour oil upon the waters, and indulge a harmonious feeling.

The Rev. Mr. Buck of Massachusetts moved to postpone the consideration of the subject till the next meeting of the Conference. Pending the question on this motion, the debate, which had been entirely courteous, though rather intense and warm, became rather personal, and a passage occurred between the Rev. Mr. Towne and Mr. George W. Bond of Boston, the latter leaving the Conference. (Mr. Bond is a merchant of conservative Unitarian tendencies.) The question on the motion of the Rev. Mr. Buck was taken, and resulted: Yeas, 91; Nays, 134.

A scene of some excitement followed, a dozen persons claiming the privilege of addressing the Conference at the same time. At length the stentorian voice of the Rev. Dr. Stebbins was heard, that gentleman moving to proceed at once to a vote on the main question.

The Rev. Dr. S. said he had traveled 350 miles to do a little Christian work, and had only thus far been treated to a purely theological discussion. He had heard this same thing debated 30 years before these young radicals were born, and we are no nearer a settlement of now than we ever were, and may never be any nearer. He wanted to hear no more of it.

The Rev. Dr. Clarke moved to amend by inserting a provision that debate on the main question shall continue during the evening, and the vote be taken at its close.

Discussion on this point followed, and Dr. Clarke's motion was lost.

The vote was taken on Mr. Abbott's proposition, and it was rejected by a very large majority, a count not being required.

The following is the Preamble and Article I of the present Constitution, which ought to be amended.

PREAMBLE.—*Whereas*, The great opportunities and demands for Christian labor and consecration at this time increase our sense of the obligations of all disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ to prove their faith by self-denial, and by the devotion of their lives and possessions to the service of God and the building up of the kingdom of his Son.—

ARTICLE I.—Therefore the Christian churches of the Unitarian faith here assembled unite themselves in a common body, to be known as the National Conference of Unitarian churches, to the end of energizing and extending the denomination with which they are connected, by the largest exertions in the cause of Christian faith and work.]

The Rev. Dr. Clarke moved to add to the above, after the words "Unitarian," in Article I (above quoted), the words, "and other Christian churches."

The Rev. Mr. Hatch of Concord, N. H., moved to amend Dr. Clarke's motion, by saying "religious societies" instead of "Christian churches."

A delegate inquired whether the Mormon organization was not a religious society? [Laughter.]

Several amendments were proposed and voted down, and finally the Rev. Dr. Clarke's proposition was assented to, with a few voices in the negative.

The debate having consumed the entire afternoon, an adjournment till evening was had, at about 5½ p. m.

EVENING.

The Conference assembled in Wieting Hall, for a meeting in the interest of missionary labor, the public having been invited to attend. The hall was filled in every part.

The Rev. Charles Lowe, Secretary of the American Unitarian Association, presented statistics showing that at present the denomination employs 40 ministers as missionaries, and sustains 81 preachers in a partial work of a missionary nature in conjunction with parish duties. There have been 81 places in which Unitarian preaching has been supplied, independently of any regular effort in that direction, and 30 needy churches have been helped by the funds of the Association. The Secretary followed with an address, showing the breadth of the field, and the incentives to enter upon it and labor.

Other addresses in behalf of missions followed from the Rev. Dr. Hosmer, the Rev. Dr. Collier, the Rev. Dr. Bellows, the Rev. Mr. Hepworth and others.

During the meeting the ears of the delegates were regaled with the sound of booming guns, almost directly under the hall windows, and the result of the Tuesday's elections was appropriately noticed in the speeches of the evening.

The sessions of to-day were very largely attended, the church being packed throughout the entire duration of the meeting. The session of the afternoon is pronounced a memorable one. The discussion was carried on by men of great ability, and even to a person of any other sect (and there were such present) could not have been devoid of great interest.

The Conference will undoubtedly adjourn finally on Thursday evening.

THE COUNCIL AT BALTIMORE.

APPEARANCE OF THE BISHOPS—THE PROMINENT MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.

From Our Special Correspondent.

BALTIMORE, Oct. 9, 1866.

It was not easy on Sunday to form much of an idea of the personal appearance of the members of the council as they met in state in the cathedral, for when they have their miters on all bishops look alike. You see nothing but the tips of their noses, and the setting of gold which surrounds the face seems to rob even those expressive features of their wonted character and significance. But a very large proportion of them are noble-looking men. Archbishop Spalding, the head of the synod and in a certain sense the presiding Archbishop of the United States, is of fine personal development, about the middle hight, with regular but rather small features, gray hair, ruddy cheeks, a graceful demeanor, and polished manners. He possesses a remarkable combination of qualifications for his present position. A Kentuckian by birth, and a descendant of an old American Catholic family, he is not less thoroughly imbued with the spirit of our