THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WHOLE NO. 8479. MORNING EDITION—WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1859. PRICE TWO CENTS.

THE ABOLITION MOVEMENT.

Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans.

MEETING OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH—THE MISS JOHNSTONE MISSION APPROVED AFTER A PROTRACTED DEBATE—THE STATEMENT IN CONNECTION THEREWITH—RESOLUTIONS, ETC.

A meeting of members of the Church of the Puritans, Union square, was held on Monday last, when an exciting and warm debate took place with reference to Miss Johnstone's mission to England and Dr Cheever's action with reference thereto.

The meeting was presided over by Mr. O. J. Bennett.

MOTION TO EXCLUDE REPORTERS.

Before the regular business was commenced a motion was moved and seconded to the effect that all persons present not members of the church should retire.

One gentleman took exception to this motion, so far as it related to some ladies present, who, though not members of the church, were members of the congregation. The motion he thought ought not to apply to them.

Another member took exception to the motion, so far as it might relate to the reporters of the press.

Mr. FAIRBANKS said the resolution to expel reporters from their meeting that evening might be wise, but it certainly struck him as very unwise. Reporters of the press at the present age of the world were an institution of great value, and so necessary had they become and so persevering were they in giving the public the benefit of their services, that they might just as well undertake to keep flies from the head of a molasses barrel, as reporters from any meeting which excited public interest. Besides, it was useless to do so, for the very birds of the air would carry to the newspaper press intelligence of whatever might be done there that evening. The experiences of this church, as well as the experience of all political bodies—Know Nothings among the number—bodies of men bound together by solemn compact not to reveal anything that might transpire at their meetings—show that it was as impossible to keep the doings of meetings from appearing in the newspapers the next morning as it was to keep the air from blowing.

A motion was then put "that the reporters of the press be requested to withdraw."

The motion was lost by a large majority.

OBJECT OF THE MEETING.

The CHAIRMAN then read the advertisement calling the meeting, and requested that the persons interested would state the object of it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS then rose and said that the gentlemen who had taken an active part in late affairs in connection with the church, had come to the determination of calling a meeting of the members of the church at once, for the purpose of ascertaining if the church was willing to hear the reasons they would assign for the course they had taken in sending Miss Johnstone to England to raise some money. This was not done in behalf of the church, as was charged against them. They could have no right to do that, and they never contemplated it, as they would show to the satisfaction of all. We never thought of taking upon ourselves such a responsibility. But they had found themselves in a very tight way. They could not get money to pay their debts, and the only way by which they could hope to go on, was by appropriating a small sum of money designed for new churches in the West, to the service of their own church here. They had been repeatedly told by wealthy members of the church that they could not go on; that the church could not be supported much longer, and that it must go down. These gentlemen—men of wealth and influence, some of them holding offices in the church—refused, when applied to for aid, to assist in averting this calamity, and refused to give a single dollar towards liquidating the the debt of the church, a debt, be it remembered, of their own contracting. Finding, therefore, that they could get nothing at home, they took the responsibility upon themselves not to send an agent to beg on behalf of the church, but to raise money to be used for sustaining the church. They felt it their duty to ask money from those who had it and who were willing to give it for sustaining a church like theirs, and they did not stop to ask whether the waters of the Atlantic rolled between them and their friends, or the prairies of Illinois. Therefore it was that they had sanctioned the mission of Miss Johnstone to England to raise money, and they intended to place that money in the hands of a committee of seven, five of whom were to be members of the church two not connected with it, and that so long as that pulpit was faithful in denouncing slavery, the church was to have the benefit of it; but if the pastor ceased this work, then the committee would be empowered to apply it to some other worthy object. That money was intended to sustain a free unmuzzled gospel. That was it. They had drawn up a statement of all the circumstances, which was now ready to be submitted to the meeting.

Dr. HARTT rose to read the statement, but was interrupted by Mr. Harvey, who opposed the reading of the statement, on the ground that it was drawn up by a self-constituted committee, without the sanction or concurrence of the church. He demanded on behalf of the church that all the circumstances connected with Miss Johnstone's mission to England be publicly announced by those who had in any way recommended such an undertaking, so that the odium of the fact should rest with them alone.

Mr. FAIRBANKS spoke at considerable length in favor of having the statement referred to read. He thought the meeting ought to hear that statement, but if they did not it was a matter of no great consequence, for whether they received it or not, they intended to have it published both in this country and in England.

The question was then put from the Chair, whether the statement be read or not, and carried in the affirmative.

Dr. HARTT, in introducing the subject, said that he was one of the members of the committee referred to, and was happy at having an opportunity of rendering an account of their stewardship. Their only regret was that they had no funds at present, but they trusted they would come in one season. Last year Dr. Cheever and two of the authors of the appeal, with the aid of one of the trustees who voted for the resolutions which were published the other day, succeeded in raising two thousand dollars in this city for the benefit of the church. This year they hoped to raise a much larger amount outside of the city. There was no objection on the part of the trustees or any one else to their operation then; why should there be to their operation now? They made precisely the same representations concerning the church and its wants to their friends here than they had made to their brethren in Great Britain. Where, then, was the difference? If they had a right, as individual members of the church, to go to merchants and members of other churches in New York, and tell them that the Church of the Puritans wanted funds, which the trustees either would not or could not furnish, and that if they wished this noble citadel of truth and freedom to stand, they must come to its aid, then, he maintained, they had precisely the same right to go to Christian men in any city or in any land with similar representations and with a similar request. What would they have thought if the Board of Trustees, after the annual meeting in March, had held two protracted meetings, and published resolutions to the effect that Dr. Cheever and Dr. Hartt, by and with the consent of two other brethren, had gone round the city of New York to obtain funds for the Church of the Puritans, thereby assuming functions and prerogatives which did not belong to them, and inflicting a serious injury upon said church, for which most unwarrantable act they could not hold themselves responsible? And then suppose all the papers in the city, religious and secular, democratic and republican, had come out with long articles headed "A Disgraceful Appeal," and stigmatizing the Church of the Puritans as a mendicant church, and charging its pastor with everything that was bad; and then, supposing that the church itself had been compelled to cease its exercises, and obliged to call a meeting to adjust the difficulty, would they not have concluded, from the simple fact of the case, that they had been seized with a panic almost as ridiculous as that which had seized the Virginians? But this would not have been a whit more preposterous than the excitement that has been raised by our appeal to Great Britain. It was the right of every member of this church, if he found it in need, to obtain aid for it in any quarter, upon fair and honest representation. He had as much right to labor in any and every direction for the supply of its temporal wants as he had for the supply of its spiritual wants, and the church should no more find fault with him in the one case than in the other. They would apprehend no danger of rebuke in making the most mournful representations and confessions of their condition at the throne of grace in telling the King of Kings, surrounded by all the hierarchies of heaven, that they were poor, and wretched, and blind, and miserable, and naked, and had need of all things. But if they go to their beloved brethren in Great Britain, bound to them by every sacred tie, and tell them that by reason of a terrible conflict in which they were engaged with their enemies and ours, and that they needed their aid to carry on the war, and that if they, in their turn, should ask our contributions to help them in a battle against the opium trade in China or against governmental complicity with idol worship in India, we at this side of the Atlantic would cheerfully render it. A church ashamed of poverty, brought on by faithfulness to Christ in carrying on His great purposes of benevolence, already begins to draw back to perdition; and therefore they ought not to be ashamed of applying for relief to their friends in England. He proceeded to read the following statement:—

A STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE APPEAL TO THE CHURCHES OF GREAT BRITAIN IN BEHALF OF THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS, BY ITS AUTHORS.

The publication of a letter from the Rev. Dr. Cheever to the Rev. Mr. Spurgeon, with reference to an appeal to the churches in Great Britain for sympathy and aid in his conflict with the slave power, has produced considerable excitement and remark. A portion both of the religious and secular press have thought it necessary to comment upon it with great earnestness, and to make it the occasion of severe and bitter strictures upon the ministerial character and labors of Dr. Cheever.

The trustees of the Society of the Church of the Puritans have also felt themselves called upon to publish a series of resolutions, disavowing all responsibility for the measure, and expressing their disapprobation of it—thus placing themselves before the world in direct antagonism with the pastor.

Under these circumstances, the authors of the appeal deem it their duty to state freely and fully the reasons which led them to make it, and which, in their opinion, rendered it necessary and right. An article has already appeared on the subject, by one of our number, which, though unanswerable in its argument, was open to the charge of personality and vituperation. The writer is a young man who has only recently been converted, under the ministry of Dr. Cheever. Like Peter, in his indignation he seized a sword, and cut off the ear of a servant of the High Priest, and, as the age of miracles is past, it cannot be healed; but he has already repented, and now again appears in the field, with tempered zeal and chastened spirit, to do good service, we trust, in the cause of truth, and to strengthen his brethren.

The removal of the disaffected parties from the church, after a protracted and bitter controversy, inspired Dr. Cheever and his friends with the hope of permanent peace, and the full triumph of those great principles for which they had contended. But it soon appeared that the opposition remained.

DEBT AND DIFFICULTIES.

At a meeting of the Trustees in December last the Treasurer reported a debt of $3,500, whereupon one of those gentlemen said that he would not give a dollar to ward the payment of it, and advised as the only means of saving the church, that Dr. Cheever should be dismissed, and the band of his enemies who had left should be recalled. Another said he had only remained in the church, for a long time, because it was in trouble, but he would give nothing. One gentleman also was present, and took part on that occasion, who had withdrawn his membership in consequence of his dissatisfaction with the pastor's ministry. These facts were mentioned by an officer of the Board of Trustees to one of the authors of the appeal and he assured him at the same time that the church must go down, and further remarked that in his opinion, no thoroughgoing anti-slavery ministry could be sustained in the city of New York.

Immediately after this meeting a statement appeared in a letter of the New York correspondent of a Boston journal, that Dr. Cheever had resigned.

It was obvious that dissatisfaction existed, and there was reason to fear that at the annual meeting in March, when the debt should be announced, it would be seized and set forth as an evidence of the inefficiency and unpopularity of the pastor's ministry, and a proposition be made for his removal.

In order to obviate this danger, Dr. Cheever and one of his warmest supporters made a special effort, and succeeded in obtaining from parties in and out of the church about half the amount of the debt.

HALF THE DEBT SUBSCRIBED FOR.

At the annual meeting, when the announcement was made that this sum had been raised and deposited in the bank, the opponents of Dr. Cheever saw that their plan had been defeated. An official member of the church then offered to give $250 towards the remainder of the debt, provided the whole amount should be raised by the 1st of May, and $1,000 pledged to meet the probable deficiency of the next year. Others followed with promises of various sums upon a similar condition. It was thought by some that the demand for the pledge was unnecessary; but in order to secure the amounts thus proposed it was given on the spot—the young men of the church with a noble generosity, offering from $25 to $100 each from their limited incomes.

The hope was cherished that, after this demonstration, the disaffected parties, seeing that their designs were frustrated, would give up their opposition.

After the annual meeting, about $800 of the debt still remained, and a committee was appointed to raise this amount by the 1st of May.

Meanwhile an application was made to the church by the agent of the Congregational Union for a contribution to aid weak churches in the West; $3 050 were subscribed—a large portion of which was given by those who cannot be relied upon in an extremity brought on by a conflict with the slave power, and several wealthy members who would not give one dollar toward the liquidation of the debt, contributed $250 each for this object.

In the end, a few who are devoted to the principles of freedom were obliged, in order to secure the sums conditionally pledged, to postpone for a time the payment of the money they had promised to the weak churches in the West, and apply them to their own weak church in the East.

WEALTHY MEMBERS RESIGN.

On the list of May the debt was paid, but our wealthy friends, instead of returning to their duty, relinquished their pews, and $1,000 of our ordinary revenue were struck off.

APPLICATION TO ENGLISH ABOLITIONISTS.

In the midst of these perplexities, a few of us who believed that we enjoyed the confidence of the majority of the church, with the concurrence of Dr. Cheever, deemed it advisable to appeal to our brethren in England. We knew that if we laid the matter before the whole body, or even advised with a large number of those who sympathized with us it would receive immediate publicity, bring down upon our heads a storm such as is now pelting us from every quarter, and, what was of infinitely more consequence to us, set our enemies on the alert and give them an opportunity of throwing obstacles in our way from the start, on the ground where we designed to work. We addressed a letter to the British churches, in which we simply gave an outline of the conflict in which the Church of the Puritans had been engaged for a few years past with the slave power and its consequent losses and embarrassments, carefully abstaining from all allusion to internal dissensions, dissatisfaction, or apprehended treachery.

MODEST EXPECTATIONS.

We committed it to the charge of Miss Johnstone, a member of the church, who was desirous of visiting her friends in Scotland, with instructions that she should present it to the clergymen of different denominations who sympathized with us on the question of slavery in order to raise funds, not only sufficient to secure us against the possibility of a present defeat, but also if possible, *to establish a foundation of $20,000 or $30,000* for the perpetual liquidation of the ground rent.

HOW THE SECRET LEAKED OUT.

Through some mistake it fell into the hands of a correspondent of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, and was noticed as an item of news in a communication to that paper. Immediately the *Independent*, without inquiry of Dr. Cheever, published an editorial on the subject, treating it as a hoax, and representing the Church of the Puritans as in a most flourishing condition. The reasons which induced us to avoid publicity at first prevented us from answering that editorial; but inasmuch as it placed Miss Johnstone in a false position in Great Britain, and threw a serious difficulty in the way of her mission, we were, of course, obliged to meet it there. Dr. Cheever was directly applied to by a person in England, and the substance of his reply, afterward sent to Mr. Spurgeon, is the document which is now producing so much disturbance.

CHEERING INTELLIGENCE.

We are happy to say that we have just received the most cheering intelligence from Great Britain, that our faith in the sympathy of Christians there was well founded, and that there is every probability that the mission will succeed. *The head and heart of all Christendom outside this country—aye, and in this country too, far more than men dream of, respond to the sentiment uttered by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Hon. Charles Sumner, "that Christianity and slavery ought not to be mentioned in the same day."*

But why may not the faithful friends of freedom, persecuted and sorely pressed by the slave power, go for aid and comfort where that sentiment is not only cherished as a thought or feeling, but where it is expressed without restraint? The Church of Christ is a universal brotherhood. It recognizes no distinction of nation, race or color. Whatever rules politicians may adopt with regard to trade its commerce is free, and its sympathies are unrestricted. The American church has never thrown open its doors to Christian pilgrims from every land, and liberally responded to every legitimate appeal for aid. France, England, Scotland, Ireland—the richest and most cultivated countries of the world—have not deemed it disgraceful to ask and receive its offerings. Shall it alone be too proud to ask or receive?

Shall it alone permit the interests of Christ's kingdom to suffer, and his poor to perish, from a false and pitiful spirit that will not brook the confession of want?

DR. CHEEVER DEFENDED.

It may, indeed, be galling to the people of this great Christian republic, after their grand revolt against the tyranny of Britain, and all their proud boasts of freedom, to be obliged to publish there that an eminent minister of Christ, well known by his works in all the churches, has been ostracised, persecuted and almost driven from his post, in consequence of his faithfulness and courage in denouncing an unrelenting system of oppression and wrong maintained and defended by their government and laws. We do not wonder that an attempt should be made to impair the force and pungency of this terrible fact by the pretended discovery of some apology for this wickedness in the spirit or manner with which this awful battle against the sin of slaveholding has been conducted. But it is vain. The severity of Dr. Cheever is the severity of truth; his sternness, the sternness of justice; his hatred, a hatred of wrong. He has no bitterness. A kinder heart never beat. The tremendous energy and prophet-like fidelity with which he proclaims the denunciations of God's word against oppression, springs from the very depth and intensity of his love to God and man. It is a shame that a man so meek, gentle and unselfish in all the walks of social life, and so regardless of his own reputation or interests in his public career—a man ever ready to throw himself into the gap to defend the truth, at whatever cost—should be charged with the want of genuine kindness. Nor will a reference to the popularity of eminent clergymen who profess anti-slavery principles avail. We admit that they are opposed to the system of slavery and would rejoice to see it abolished. But do they believe in the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, and would they exclude the slaveholder from the Christian church, just as they would the habitual perpetrator and upholder of any other flagrant vice? As a class, we have abundant evidence to compel us to reply in the negative. They do not and will not lay the axe at the root of the tree, by preaching against the sin of slaveholding. They will tell you that slavery in the world will last for ages; that the low, animal condition of the negro enslaves him, or at least justifies his continuance in bondage for a time; that the African race have not yet reached their spring time, and must be left to the influence of national freedom and the slow process of those moral and intellectual forces which may reach them under all the terrible disadvantages of their condition, for the discovery of their manhood and the assertion of their rights. They attack the evils of slaveholding and not the radical sin itself. They are very gentle to the southern sin and would hold them affectionately to their hearts and we see no reason why they should not do so in a perpetual embrace. There is scarcely a slaveholder who pretends to the decencies of religion who would not readily subscribe to every one of these principles. But let them hear the report of a single gun from the logic of the Word of God against slavery as manstealing, and they would fall back in a moment, and with indignant and defiant air upbraid them as fanatics and madmen, and no blandness of manner or sweetness of tone would win them back to courtesy, much less to friendship.

There is another point of contrast between the anti-slavery ministration of Dr. Cheever and those of his brethren, which sheds much light upon the different degrees of favor with which they are received. Dr. Cheever has grappled with the subject. He has pursued it though all its ramifications, and discussed it with a thoroughness and elaborateness which its own intrinsic importance, and the condition of the American church and nation which regard it imperatively demanded. He has met the aggressions and developements of the slave power, whether they have appeared in the form of Congressional legislation, decisions of courts or acts of ecclesiastical bodies, with the opposing testimony and burning denunciations of the word of God. The Fugitive Slave bill, the Dred Scott decision, the treachery of the American Tract Society and the American Board, have in turn felt the withering power of his faithful rebuke. Indeed, so numerous and repeated have been his blows, that, during the last few years, the general impression has been that he was absorbed in the subject, though we, who enjoy the privilege of sitting under his ministry, and, therefore, have a right to judge do solemnly declare our belief that, within this very period, he has presented from the pulpit as great a variety of rich, profound, original and profitable thought on purely spiritual themes as any minister in the United States. Now, no one, we think, will pretend that any other minister connected with the orthodox churches has put forth his strength against slavery in a similar degree or has manifested anything like the same anxiety or purpose for its immediate and entire abolition by the power of divine truth.

It will be seen by the statement we have made that neither the Church of the Puritans nor the Board of Trustees have the slightest responsibility in this matter. We did believe that when the time came for laying it before the church a majority would sanction it; and, now that it has been thrust upon us prematurely, and every kind of effort is put forth to increase our embarrassment, we have not lost our confidence. We cannot think that the spirit of infatuation could so far take possession of our brethren as to allow them to lose sight of the mighty principles for which we are contending and after all our struggles, sacrifices and triumphs, to murder our own cause, and give back our noble citadel to the enemy, in consequence of some trifling differences of opinion respecting a measure admitted on all sides to have been well intended in a time of great difficulty. But if we should prove to be mistaken on this point, however deep would be our regret, we would not despair, much less would we withdraw our appeal. On the contrary, we should be obliged to urge it on with greater earnestness, for then we should not only require funds to enable us to carry on a church, but also to build one *On this Rock*, and would hold them affectionately to their hearts and we see no reason why they should not do so in a perpetual embrace. There is scarcely a slaveholder who pretends to the decencies of religion who would not readily subscribe to every one of these principles. But let them hear the report of a single gun from the logic of the Word of God against slavery as man-stealing, and they would fall back in a moment, and with indignant and defiant air upbraid them as fanatics and madmen, and no blandness of manner or sweetness of tone would win them back to courtesy, much less to friendship.

There is another point of contrast between the anti-slavery ministration of Dr. Cheever and those of his brethren, which sheds much light upon the different degrees of favor with which they are received. Dr. Cheever has grappled with the subject. He has pursued it though all its ramifications, and discussed it with a thoroughness and elaborateness which its own intrinsic importance, and the condition of the American church and nation which regard it imperatively demanded. He has met the aggressions and developements of the slave power, whether they have appeared in the form of Congressional legislation, decisions of courts or acts of ecclesiastical bodies, with the opposing testimony and burning denunciations of the word of God. The Fugitive Slave bill, the Dred Scott decision, the treachery of the American Tract Society and the American Board, have in turn felt the withering power of his faithful rebuke. Indeed, so numerous and repeated have been his blows, that, during the last few years, the general impression has been that he was absorbed in the subject, though we, who enjoy the privilege of sitting under his ministry, and, therefore, have a right to judge, do solemnly declare our belief that, within this very period, he has presented from the pulpit as great a variety of rich, profound, original and profitable thought on purely spiritual themes as any minister in the United States. Now, no one, we think, will pretend that any other minister connected with the orthodox churches has put forth his strength against slavery in a similar degree or has manifested anything like the same anxiety or purpose for its immediate and entire abolition by the power of divine truth.

It will be seen by the statement we have made that neither the Church of the Puritans nor the Board of Trustees have the slightest responsibility in this matter. We did believe that when the time came for laying it before the church a majority would sanction it; and, now that it has been thrust upon us prematurely, and every kind of effort is put forth to increase our embarrassment, we have not lost our confidence. We cannot think that the spirit of infatuation could so far take possession of our brethren as to allow them to lose sight of the mighty principles for which we are contending and after all our struggles, sacrifices and triumphs, to murder our own cause, and give back our noble citadel to the enemy, in consequence of some trifling differences of opinion respecting a measure admitted on all sides to have been well intended in a time of great difficulty. But if we should prove to be mistaken on this point, however deep would be our regret, we would not despair, much less would we withdraw our appeal. On the contrary, we should be obliged to urge it on with greater earnestness, for then we should not only require funds to enable us to carry on a church, but also to build one *On this Rock*, and the whole world may depend, that, God helping us, the light which He has kindled here shall not be put out. In our hearts we believe it essential to the salvation of the church and nation. Everybody knows that Dr. Cheever is one of the ablest champions of the cause of freedom that has ever appeared, and is wielding at this moment a mighty influence throughout the country. God has said that He would never leave His church without a witness. History will recognise him in this light. Why should not we?

APPEAL TO THE ABOLITIONISTS OF NEW YORK.

We trust that the Christian abolitionists of New York will no longer stand by and see him deserted, reviled, broken down inch by inch, struggling against fearful odds, but will rally at once and in a body, to his support. We trust that in the light of this great cause they will perceive the utter insignificance of all ordinary excuses based upon church ties, associations, friendships, family preferences, dislikes; and that, remembering those solemn words of Jesus, "he that loveth father or mother, husband or wife, brother or sister, houses or lands, more than me, is not worthy of me," they will now come forth and stand up for him in the true sense of that memorable charge as it fell from the lips of the dying Tyng, by standing up for the enslaved; and by standing up for the great standard bearer entrenched on Union square, to whom that young hero pointed in the last speech he ever made on a platform in this city, and said "if he be sustained then no clergyman in this land shall have cause to fear."

Christian abolitionists throughout the United States, *the Church of the Puritans is a national church*. God has made it so. The great truths uttered there in the heart of the metropolis, are carried on the wings of the press throughout the land. You have all read them and pondered them, and they have given you courage and hope. But you have not known till now the mighty struggles and sacrifices it has cost to maintain it. We have reached a crisis. Will you consent that the slave power and all the powers of darkness hell about us overwhelm? Are you willing that Dr. Cheever should be driven out on account of his brave and fateful proclamation of divine truth, and his enemies return and take possession? No. Then we earnestly entreat you to show it by your works. We want at least $50 000 to meet an annual ground rent of $1 500, and place it as nearly as possible on the foundation of a free church.

All contributions may be sent to Mr. Edwin Ferris, 185 Washington street, or to Dr Edwin West, 111 Amity street New York.

Signed in behalf of the authors of the appeal,

HENRY A. HARTT.

Dr. HARTT then read the following resolutions, which he recently received from Mr. Murdoch, of Scotland, with the request that they should be published here:—

DR. CHEEVER, OF NEW YORK, AND SLAVERY—HIS PRESENT POSITION IN REGARD TO IT.

EDINBURGH, Oct. 17, 1859.

At a meeting called to consider the position of the Rev. Dr. Cheever of New York, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, upon the report of a committee named at a previous preliminary meeting, held Oct 7:—

I. That, without entering into the ecclesiastical bearings of this case, there is evidence enough to show that Dr Cheever has seen, and is bearing a faithful testimony against the sin of American slavery, and that he is on that account involved in serious financial difficulties which not only materially affect his personal comfort, but endanger his public standing and influence as the minister of one of the most important congregations in New York.

II. That the fact that such a man as Dr. Cheever is thus situated, and for such a cause, is fitted to awaken grief and alarm in the minds of all friends of liberty, indicating, as it seems to plainly to do, the prevalence, even in the free States of America and throughout the religious community there, of views on the subject of Slavery, and the duty of Christian churches and Christian men in regard to it, that are in opposition to the spirit of the Gospel, and tend to palliate and perpetuate a system which every right-thinking man must desire to see speedily and thoroughly abolished.

III. *That the present appeal on behalf of Dr. Cheever affords a seasonable opportunity for hearing an emphatic practical testimony against American Slavery*, as well as for expressing sympathy with those who, on Christian grounds, denounce it, and suffer loss for doing so; and that it ought therefore to be promptly and liberally met.

IV. That the following gentlemen be appointed a committee to take measures for raising money by collections and private contributions, and to correspond with committees in other towns throughout the kingdom, and to adopt such other steps as to them may seem necessary—Rev. Dr. Candlish, Rev. Dr. W. L. Alexander, Rev. Dr. Glover, Rev. William Robertson, Rev. Jas. Robertson, Newington; Rev. Dr. Andrew Thomson, Rev. G. D. Cullen, Rev. Dr. Guthrie, Rev. Jonathan Watson, Rev. Dr. Begg, Gen. Anderson, John Millar, Esq.

J. BURN MURDOCH, Jr., No. 8 Manor place, Sec.

H. D. DICKIE, No. 19 George street, Treas.

By whom, as well as by members of committee, subscriptions will be received.

RESOLUTIONS.

The following resolutions were then submitted by the Rev. J. C. WARREN:—

Whereas, Neither the church as a body, nor the majority of its members, nor the trustees of the society, were consulted previous to the application made in March last by certain brethren of the church to British Christians for pecuniary aid, it is manifest that none can be held responsible for the matter or the manner of that appeal but the individuals who made it and who are now quite willing to bear that responsibility; but, whereas, some of the wealthiest men of the church and others have entirely withdrawn their support from the ordinary expenses of the society, while some of the trustees, men of ability and sagacity, now openly declare their opinion that the church and society cannot be sustained

Resolved, That we, the Church of the Puritans, assembled for this purpose by public notice from the pulpit, do hereby declare our full conviction of the propriety and necessity of such an appeal to foreign aid.

Resolved, That the document, read in this church, signed by the brethren who authorized that appeal to the British Christians, for pecuniary aid, entirely exonerates those brethren from all blame in the premises, and is hereby declared to be the deliberate judgment of the church as to the present condition of the society, and a truthful statement of the several steps by which that condition has been reached.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions with the documents above named be forwarded to Rev Dr. Candlish, of Edinburg, and Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, of London.

Two other resolutions were submitted as amendments upon the foregoing, but they were ultimately withdrawn.

A LIVELY DISCUSSION.

Mr. CHESTER objected to the statements and the resolutions which accompanied them for this reason, amongst others, that they emanated from a self-constituted authority who had not even consulted the members of the church with respect to the part they had undertaken to act. They had been told, in addition to that ground of objection, that this self-constituted committee did not care whether this meeting approved of them or not. He thought this a most gratuitous and discourteous challenge to the other members of the church. They were told that whether they approved of these documents or not they would be published to the world all the same. He, for one, would never vote for the adoption of the statement or the resolutions. That statement contained charges against individuals of the church; charges against the trustees, none of whom were present to defend themselves. But these charges were neither explicitly stated, nor were those against whom they were levelled named. Now he demanded that the charges be put into a tangible form, and that the parties referred to be named. If it was intended to arraign, impugn and use opprobrious epithets against those who might chance to differ from a certain self-constituted body of members here, he had little hope of harmony or brotherly love in the church. If the church was to be paraded before the American community with such a millstone round its neck as that, it must, indeed, and ought to go down. What position would they find themselves in before the American community when it was thus made public that the beautiful church in Union square, in the most fashionable and wealthy quarter of the city of New York—not a church established for the poor and needy, but a grand edifice where the wealth and refinement of the city came to worship, had been compelled to go to England to look for money to support it. That was bad enough, but it was far worse that those who had recommended this begging mission should give, as a reason for such an appeal, that they dare not apply to them—the general body of the church—that they dare not let it be known that they were about to make such an appeal because of certain hostility to the pastor, and to the abolition of slavery which it was known he advocated. This was all bad enough, but there was worse to come. What was the fact? They found that these charges were backed up by a letter from their pastor wherein he had brought charges not only against this church, but against the ministers and churches of the whole country—charges wherein he told his friends in England that his was the only anti-slavery church in the country. Were such charges as these to be endorsed by the church? He hoped not, but he for one would not let them go uncontradicted. What would be the result if they accepted foreign aid for the church? He could tell them that they would be no longer a self-governing church, controlling their own affairs; but they would be a dependent church controlled by those gentlemen who wished to arrogate to themselves the power of control over the funds of the church. It would be no longer the church that would control the ministrations of the Gospel, but a self appointed committee, armed with funds received from a foreign land. No church could live in this way, and he called upon the church members present to ward off the coming evil. Why should they go to England—to a poor country like that—for aid, from whence they repeatedly had missionaries asking aid to assist them in evangelizing the Irish and for other purposes. Let it once go out to the world that they were supported by English gold, and the whole influence of their pastor as the great denouncer of slavery would die out. No matter with what power of truth or intellect Dr. Cheever's war might be waged against slavery, his moral influence would be dead, and himself would be as it were a dead man. In conclusion he urged upon the meeting not to endorse the statement or the resolutions accompanying that statement. If they did they would hang a millstone round their necks which would eventually crush them.

Mr. ABERNETHY was opposed to a hasty adoption of the statement and of the resolutions. He was anxious for the good name and welfare of the church and of their pastor, and he recommended that the documents be laid on the table for the present, and that time be allowed for a full consideration of the whole matter. He commented strongly upon the wrong done to the church by the letter of Dr. Cheever, wherein that gentleman had asserted that he was surrounded by foes from within and without. He denied that there were any foes within, except, indeed, it might be that those gentlemen were foes who had taken certain responsibilities in this matter without consulting the members of the church. He would vote against the resolutions.

Rev. T. C. WARREN spoke at length in support of the statement and the resolutions.

Dr. BALL was opposed to handing over to the control of a committee the funds contemplated to be raised, as was proposed in the resolutions. He was not so averse to seeking aid wherever it could be honorably obtained.

Mr. E. FARIS spoke in favor of the adoption of the resolutions.

Professor MARTIN did not believe that Dr. Cheever could be influenced by any set of men, no matter what control they might have over the funds of the church. In that respect, he had no fear but he was strongly opposed, nevertheless, to place the disposal of any funds that might be raised in the hands of a committee. On that account he objected to the resolution. He was strongly opposed to the mission of Miss Johnstone, as the bare fact of the Church of the Puritans being the recipient of foreign aid, would greatly lessen the power and influence of their pastor as the great and unflinching advocate of abolition and the denouncer of the sin of slavery.

After a very lengthy debate it was moved that the papers be laid on the table, and the further discussion of the matters adjourned for the week. The motion was lost.

Several motions for adjournment were successively put and debated, but they were all successfully opposed, and the adoption or rejection of the papers was pressed upon the meeting.

Dr. CHEEVER, who had entered the room at a late hour, then rose and addressed the meeting briefly. He said he was very much pained at what he had heard there that evening. He admitted that he had written the letter to Mr. Spurgeon, that reference had been made to, entirely on his own responsibility, and he was surprised, subsequently, to see in the public prints resolutions from the trustees, in which they disavowed any connection with Miss Johnstone. If they had come to him the matter might have been settled amicably, but they had acted without consulting him. While absent from the city, he had received a letter from his wife, informing him that a plan had been set on foot to deprive him of his charge. He had often felt like giving the matter up, but then he felt that he was commissioned of God to keep his post, and continue in the conflict with slavery. He had received letters of encouragement from all parts of this country and Great Britain, and so long as God upheld him he would preach upon the subject.

After several ineffectual attempts on the part of those who were opposed to the adoption of the statement and resolutions to carry an adjournment, the chairman put the question whether the documents submitted be approved or not, when a considerable majority rose to the affirmative, and they were declared accepted and approved of by the Church. That is, the statement was approved and the resolutions adopted.

It was then past one o'clock in the morning, and the meeting at once adjourned.

The Mayoralty Candidates.

HAVEMEYER'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

Fernando Wood has been four times a candidate for Mayor of this city, and twice elected. In 1850 he ran against Ambrose C. Kingsland, and was defeated by the following vote:—

Ambrose C Kingsland, whig	22,478
Fernando Wood, dem	18,052
Kingsland's majority	4,426

In 1854 he ran against three other candidates, and was elected. The following was the vote cast:—

Fernando Wood, dem	20,003
James W. Barker, American	18,547
Wilson G. Hunt, reform	15,397
John J. Herrick, whig	5,996
Wood's plurality over Barker	1,456

In 1856 there were five candidates, and Wood was the successful one by the following vote:—

Fernando Wood, dem	34,566
Isaac O. Barker, American	25,182
Anthony J. Bleecker, repub	9,671
James S. Libby, independent dem	4,684
James R. Whiting, stump dem	3,638
Wood's plurality over Barker	9,384

In 1857 he received the nomination from the united democracy, but was defeated by Daniel F. Tiemann. The following was the vote cast:—

Daniel F. Tiemann, dem	43,198
Fernando Wood, dem	40,948
Tiemann's majority	2,250

William F. Havemeyer has twice run for the office, and was both times successful. In 1845 he had four opponents. The following was the vote cast for each candidate:—

Wm. F. Havemeyer, dem	24,207
James Harper, American	17,485
Dudley Selden, whig	7,032
R. Smith, reform	124
Arthur Tappan, abolition	74
Havemeyer's plurality over Harper	6,722

In 1848 Mr. Havemeyer was again nominated by Tammany Hall, and was chosen by the following vote:—

Wm. F. Havemeyer, dem	23,095
Wm. V. Brady, whig	22,107
John Commerford, reform	535
Democratic plurality	988

Of George Opdyke the public know very little. In regard to his political antecedents, we believe he has been a democrat, a loco-foco, a Van Buren barnburner, a free soiler, a Know Nothing, and is now an "irrepressible conflict" black republican, but whether of the John Brown school or not we are unable to say. He has, however, one qualification, and that is his strong opposition to the leaders of the Albany lobby gang, and that opposition was considerably strengthened by a movement from the region of Albany, which caused the Sixth Senatorial District Republican Nominating Convention of this city to send him up in a balloon, just previous to the last State election. He represented the Fourteenth district of this city in the last Legislature.

MR. HAVEMEYER'S ACCEPTANCE OF THE MAYORALTY NOMINATION.

NEW YORK, Nov. 21, 1859.

Hon. JOHN KELLY, Chairman:—

DEAR SIR—I have to day received your note of the 19th instant informing me that, "at a Mayoralty Convention held at Tammany Hall on Saturday last, I was unanimously nominated as the democratic candidate for the Mayoralty," and expressing your conviction "that my acceptance of the nomination will be hailed with gratification by the democracy and by our citizens generally." When on the first mention of my name by the public journals in connection with that office, I announced my determination not again to assume its duties, I did not suppose it possible that any circumstances could arise to change that resolution. Recognizing the duties which every good citizen owes to the community in which he lives, I still claim the right to be governed by my own conscientious judgment as to the considerations both of a public and a private nature which enter into such a question as that which you have presented to me. Having served already two terms in the Mayoralty, I felt that the surrender of my personal comfort and happiness, as well as of my private interests which it then involved, should not be repeated, without a stronger hope of public advantage than I was able to entertain, but the earnest representations of citizens of all parties, the tender to me which you have made in your nomination of Corporation Counsel, of able and faithful co-operation, with an assured identity of views as to the requirements of the municipal government, and your recognition, while offering a party nomination, that my duties extend alike to the whole people induce me to yield my judgment, and to accept the nomination which you have been commissioned to offer.

W. F. HAVEMEYER.

Theatrical Troubles—"Our American Cousin" in Court—The Afterpiece of "Turning the Tables" Performed by the Jury, who Gave a Verdict for the Defendant—The Profits of the Play Amounted to Over $40,000.

MARINE COURT.

Before Hon. Judge McCarthy and a Jury.

Nov. 22—*Edward A. Sothern vs. Laura Keene.*—This case was resumed this morning.

John E. Hawker deposed that he knows the parties to this suit; that he called on Mr. Lutz the day after the agreement was signed, and called the Monday week after; Sothern asked Lutz if he meant that paper to be an engagement; Lutz said not until "The American Cousin" was played; that that piece of paper (the agreement) was not to prevent him playing at Niblo's for a benefit which he was then arranging with Mr. Moore; called the following morning with plaintiff at the box office, and plaintiff demanded his salary; Lutz said he would pay him when he played; plaintiff asked, "Is that your answer?" Lutz said yes; plaintiff said he had always held himself ready to play in the "American Cousin."

Sherman V. Stevens deposed that he was treasurer for plaintiff while he had the defendant's theatre; I was there the night he gave up the theatre and refunded the money to the audience; there was no play that night; Mr. Couldock and Miss Stevens played in "Our American Cousin" last season.

After some further testimony,

Mr. Lutz was recalled, and testified that the profits of the play of "Our American Cousin," which was performed about one hundred and sixty nights, amounted to over $40,000.

The Court having charged the jury, the jury retired, and in a few minutes brought in a verdict for the defendant, allowing her $357 60, being her cla