Military committee, the same that reported in the Pacheco claim, but a majority of the *honorable* and *distinguished* members of that committee concluded to smuggle the petition and say nothing about the case, for fear if they reported against it they might justly be charged with deserting their own precedent, and if they reported favorably they might in all probability be overwhelmed with a flood of claims growing out of the slaughtering operations in Mexico. Poor fellows, they *dare* not own their own ill-begotten bantling. I do not blame them.

Excitement and Agitation.

The present time is one of intense interest. Questions of vital importance are presented to the minds of our fellow-citizens. In a few months a convention is to be held for remodeling our State constitution, for changing, in all probability, in many important features the organic law, the law of laws, of the Commonwealth.

Of the various subjects which the proposed convention brings before the mind, no one can surpass, no one can equal, in interest and importance, the subject of emancipation. In this are involved not merely pecuniary considerations, but the character, the moral and social condition of the community. Other changes may be made in the constitution without affecting very materially the general interests of the State; but no change in regard to slavery can be made without producing the most marked effect—without exerting the most enduring influence, not only upon one class, but upon all classes, upon the State universally, in all its relations and interests.

Whether the influence will be for good or ill is not the question before us now, but that the influence will be great, either for good or for ill, none can doubt.

The subject of emancipation is then, confessedly, one of exceeding, of transcendant, importance. Such being its importance, we should suppose that of all subjects this is the one demanding immediate and thorough discussion. And, accordingly, we find that from various quarters of the State comes as urgent demand for light and information. Constant and earnest solicitations are made by citizens of widely remote sections of the State, that provision be made through the press and orally for a faithful and impartial discussion of the subject, that the way may be prepared for wise and efficient action.

What response is given to this demand for information? Some of the journals of the State at once open their colums to the discussion, while others, and among them some which by their wide circulation have a vast influence, positively refuse to discuss the subject at all. And why? On what do they base their refusal? On a conviction that slavery is right and its perpetuity desirable? No. As far as our knowledge goes, there is not a newspaper in Kentucky which does not speak of slavery as an evil, and does not profess to desire its ultimate extinction. Why then do they refuse to discuss the subject? For two reasons.—First, because they fear lest a discussion of emancipation should injure their respective parties; and, secondly, because they think the discussion will lead to excitement and agitation.

Now, in regard to the first reason we have nothing to say. To those to whom party interests are of more importance than any and all other interests; who think that the great work of an editor is to stand sentenced for his party, with "expediency" rather than "right" for his watchword, this reason will be all-sufficient. But to all such we would say, remember that the right, the simple right, always proves, in the long run, the most expedient, and that no party, whatever be its name, Whig or Democrat, or whatever its professions, can long maintain its hold upon the respect and affections of the community, unless it be identified with the best interests of humanity.

Upon the second reason, alleged for refusal to discuss the subject of emancipation, we have some remark to offer.

"Discussion will cause excitement and agitation." Undoubtedly it will, but what then? Was there ever a good cause, whose progress was not advanced and whose success secured by agitation? The Reformation was attended with intense excitement, by fearful agitation; but what friend of religious liberty now deplores that agitation? The American revolution was attended with great agitation; but what American heart now bewails that agitation as a calamity, or condems it as a wrong? The truth is that all the great triumphs of humanity have been attended with excitement. The world's epochs have been periods of agitation.

But why this sensitive dread of agitation? Agitation is not violence, nor is it necessarily accompanied with violence. It is earnestness, excitement, if you will, but what is there peculiarly fearful in excitement? The more excitement we have the better, provided it be in behalf of a good cause and unattended with violence and unembittered by the spirit of denunciation. Lethargy, not excitement, death, not life, is to be dreaded by a community. Ill does it become us Americans to deprecate excitement, and shrink from it. The spirit of liberty is a spirit of excitement. Despotism may dread agitation—republicanism has naught to fear from it. Passionate, reckless excitement may be viewed with alarm, but the excitement of earnest thought and glowing feeling, especially when kindled in the cause of right, and in behalf of humanity and social well-being, is to be hailed with joy. It is life, will give life, and where there is life there is hope. A living people is always a hopeful people, and an advancing people. And, further, a living community is a safe community. The living, flowing stream never creates miasma. In the stagnant pond are bred corruption and death.

Cuba, with its moral and intellectual stagnancy, is in danger; America, with its life and freedom, is safe.

But admitting, for the sake of argument that agitation is an evil, can measures ever be taken for effecting emancipation without causing agitation? As long as slavery exists, the very mention of its cessation will produce excitement. Let the discussion be postponed fifty or a hundred years, and then, no less than now, its commencement will be the beginning of an agitation, a wide, general, universal agitation, which will not subside until the matter is settled, wisely, satisfactorily and conclusively settled.

But the difficulties and dangers attendant upon the discussion of emancipation, instead of being diminished by delay, will, we firmly believe, be greatly, immeasurably increased. The longer slavery exists, the more complicated are the interests involved; the more intricate the problem to be solved. And be it remembered that at some time the solution *must* be made. It is only a question of time, for whether deferred for a longer or shorter period, the subject of emancipation must be met, considered and decided.

The necessity is virtually admitted even by those who now depreciate discussion, for they all speak of slavery as an evil and a wrong, and all refer to its future extinction as inevitable.

The question is not, *now or never*, but *now or hereafter*—and which is the wiser course to meet it manfully now, or wait till the difficulties are incalculably increased?

"But let it alone, and slavery will die."

This assertion is made very frequently and with confidence, as if it were a self-evident truth. To us this is by no means a self-evident truth, and we should like to have its correctness demonstrated. When our fathers formed the Constitution of the United States, they sanguinely hoped that slavery would soon die.—But what is the fact? Instead of dying, it has continued to live, and, not only to live, but has diffused itself over territories which our ancestors never dreamed would be blighted by its poisonous breath. Surely this does not look like death.

"But slavery must die. *It will kill itself.*" How so? We confess that we do not understand the suicidal process by which this desirable end is to be accomplished. Will slavery starve itself, or hang itself, or drown itself? And by what motive will it be actuated in this, the only justifiable instance of self-murder? By benevolence, malice, or despair? Perhaps, you may think that it will die in very shame. Say you that such will be eventually the feeling of the civilized world in regard to slavery, that the slaveholding States will be obliged, in self-defence, to give up the institution? Do you mean that the citizens of the States, which above all others, pride themselves on their chivalry and independence, are to be driven *by shame* to do what they would refuse to do on the ground of right? We should be sorry to believe that such an imputation is deserved by our own State, or by her sister States of the South.

Or do you mean that hereafter the evils of slavery will become so terrible, its burden so heavy, that the State, in self-preservation, will be obliged to destroy the Institution?

Very probably this will be the result, if action be continually deferred. Danger and suffering, may compel posterity to do the work of emancipation, but the accomplishment of the work under such circumstances, will be a fearful task.—The performance of the work in such circumstances, under the pressure of such motives, will be attended with an agitation which might well blanch the cheek of the bravest, an agitation, which will shake the beloved Commonwealth to its centre, if not rend it asunder. Where is there a man whose heart has known one throb of generous emotion, who can calmly contemplate such a result? Benevolence, patriotism, religion, all high principles and noble feeling, prompt us to make any sacrifice rather than impose upon posterity such a necessity. We profess regret that our ancestors have bequeathed the legacy of slavery to us.—Shall we prove the hollowness of our professions by entailing a greater curse upon those who are to follow us?

The truth is, as it seems to us, that the idea of slavery killing itself is the merest delusion, as baseless as the shadowy fabric of a dream. Slavery will cease when the people determine it shall cease. Its cessation will be the result, not of chance, nor of the unconscious course of events, but *of deliberate determination*. And that determination, whenever it shall be made, must be preceeded by discussion and agitation.

Is it not, then, the wiser course to meet the question at once? Never was there a more propitious time for discussion.—Let the subject then, be discussed, fairly, thoroughly discussed. If slavery can be proved a blessing, let it be so proved, and let the panoply of the new Constitution be thrown over it to guard and preserve it forever. But if it be proved an evil, then let measures be taken for its cessation.

Such seems to us the course of wisdom and humanity.—*Louisville Exam.*

COMMUNICATED.

From the Field of Labor.

RANDOLPH, Feb. 7, 1849.

My last left me arrived at Suffield, Thursday, Jan. 18th. Found that the school-house where I was going to lecture was the head-quarters of Methodism, and that a revival meeting was to commence in it Saturday evening, to continue as long as there were indications of good. So I spoke Thursday and Friday nights with reference to revivals of pro-slavery religion, and at the close of the last meeting, told the people that if the Methodist meeting the next night was to be a free one, as it ought to be, I would attend and take part in it, but as it was not going to be such a one, I should hold meetings of my own, both that night and the next day, in another school-house near by, and should expose the wicked religion of the revivalists, and warn everybody against it. I did so, and had as large an audience as the preachers.—Sunday night the house was so full before I got there, that a great many had to stand up, and they kept coming in for a long time after. By the time I had spoken an hour, they began to be disorderly, talking, laughing, and making so much noise it was difficult to proceed; but on my taking up the Bible, and telling them I would read what God said about going to meeting, they were silent for half an hour, when it began to be all *buzz* again—so much so, that in a short time very few in the house could hear what I said, though I talked as loud as I could. All at once there was a general break up, and a rush for the door from all parts of the room; the lights were extinguished; I was hustled into the street in short order; and cheering ensued which was heard by people in their houses a half mile off. Monday evening I spoke at the centre of the town. Debated the question of disunion with a man by the name of Thorp.

Tuesday night spoke in Brimfield, in the Baptist church, and appointed a meeting in the same place for the next evening, but the rain prevented its being held. Staid in Brimfield till Saturday noon, writing. Put up with H. L. Carter, formerly one of the pillars of Liberty Party in this county, but now engulphed, swallowed up, lost, in the Free Soil movement. Quite a rapid descent has he accomplished from the comparatively high position he occupied in 1840—alone with 7000 who could not vote for a slaveholder nor pro-slavery man, (that is, pro-slavery in the political parties, for they all voted for those who were pro-slavery in the *churches*,) to his present depth in the mud and mire of slavery, along side of 300,000 others floundering in the same black morass, and almost burying themselves beneath its surface in their attempts to elevate to the first office in the nation, a man who goes in for the continued existence of the whole system of slavery both in the fifteen States and in the District of Columbia. And why this descent? It was for the sake of these 3,000,000; that is, for the sake of "*availability*." And why was Gen. Taylor nominated at Philadelphia? Simply for the sake of this same "availability." So the members of the old Liberty party are guilty of the same recreancy to principle for the sake of success which they charge so lustily upon the northern Whigs for their support of old Zack, and even go so far as to gulph down the whole bitter pill of slavery undiluted, for the paltry consideration of 300,000 votes against its further extension. If this is not a reproduction on the stage of the old tragedy of Jonah in the whale's belly, only with new names for the actors, I do not know what could be.—Why can't the Liberty men see that they are not contending for *half* so much now, as they were eight long years ago? And why can't the Free Soilers *all* see that while they are refusing their consent to slavery *extension*, they are at the same moment *giving* it to slavery *existence*? Why can't they see that their votes just as much say that they will *preserve* slavery in *fifteen old* States, as that they will not *create* it in *two new* ones? Why can't they see it is no worse to hold a few slaves a thousand miles off, than to bind 3,000,000 at our very doors? And even if the Free Soilers did *not* vote for the continuance of slavery where it already exists—even if they all considered the Constitution anti-slavery, and cast their suffrages for a man who, like Gerrit Smith, would carry it out as such, thus voting for *immediate abolition*, yet why can't they see that even *then* they would not manifest so strong disapprobation of the system as they would by separating from those who are guilty of it, and saying to those monsters of wickedness, "come not near to us, stand by yourselves, we'll have nothing to do with you"? Why can't *all* men see that "No Union with Slaveholders" is not merely the only consistent position of those who are opposed to those slaveholders, but *is in itself the only real opposition*, every thing that comes short of it being *approval*, since voluntary association necessarily implies approval?

This same H. L. Carter used to be a Colonel, but resigned some years ago, and now calls himself a disciple of Elihu Burritt—whose 'Christian Citizen' he reads—and a non-resistant. A fine specimen of non-resistance! Refuse to be a Colonel, and then employ somebody else to be. Say you will not fight, and then appoint Martin Van Buren commander-in-chief of the army and navy. Denounce war, and then take an oath of allegiance to the war governments of Ohio and the United States, and in particular, swear to support the Constitution of the latter, which expressly authorizes piracy. And even Burritt's Christian Citizen recommends no purer morality—no higher reform than this! Why will men consent to have their opinions moulded by the teachings of such a man? Why will they continue to drink in the sentiments—mere milk-and-water dilutions—of this Citizen, the National Era, Ohio Standard, and Cleveland True Democrat? There is more of the soul of true progress in one number of Garrison's Liberator, than in the weekly issues of all these papers for a whole year.

Saturday afternoon went to the corner of Rootstown, and spoke an hour in the league-meeting that evening. Talked the next day on the subject of sectarianism in connection with slavery. That night, when we got to the school-house, we found six of our Methodist friends assembled for a prayer meeting. From everything I could learn, I am bound in all candor to believe that they came there on purpose to conflict with our appointment, made the evening previous; for though it had been their custom to meet there every Sunday night, yet they had not done so for three or four weeks on account of preaching at the centre—they were having a revival there—and there was preaching there that night. The house was full, and all were in favor of our having a meeting, except the six Methodists. In fact, there would have been none but those six there, if it had not been given out that there was to be an Anti-Slavery lecture. So we asked them to give way. They refused. We then told them that *we* would give way, and stay and hear them till they got done, only asking, that afterwards they would stay and hear *us*. So they went on with their meeting, exhorting, singing, (in which the comeouters good naturedly joined,) and praying seven times, particularly "for the young man who was going to give an *oration*, or whatever else it might be called, *that God would give him religion*." The instant they were done, the Heightons broke out in one of the most beautiful and christian songs I ever heard. It was so good that the leader of the former meeting, though he had his hat in his hand ready to jump the moment it was finished, could not stir to go. But as soon as the echoes ceased, almost before I could rise to my feet, he was marching straight out of the house, followed by one or two of the others, in spite of the pleasant and earnest entreaties of those whom they passed in getting to the door. I immediately commenced talking in a kind and affectionate manner to the three or four who remained. Presently I had occasion to speak of the great sin of voting for Taylor, when one of them—who voted for old Zack, and had his Taylor hat on at that very meeting—nudged his nearest neighbor's elbow, and whispered, "let's go," and out they all walked but one, who staid through the whole evening, and whom I lectured personally I should think nearly two hours. But they *carried not one of the congregation with them*; all remained and listened, for the most part attentively, to an exposition of the nature of true christianity, and to the teachings of God himself on the subject of religious meetings, as contained in the first chapter of Isaiah. By the way, the good Methodist friend who was so effectually placed *hors du combat* by my rebuke of the sin of voting for Gen. Taylor, declared, soon after the Philadelphia nomination, that he had rather his right hand should drop from its shoulder blade, than cast a ballot for that great Mexican cut-throat; and when, still later, a hand-bill was posted up on that very school-house, calling on the people to attend a *Free Soil* Convention at Ravenna, to be addressed by Thomas Corwin in favor of the election of *Gen. Taylor*, he said he wished somebody would go and write on that notice "*it's a —— lie!*" In *his* case, therefore, no wonder "the hit bird fluttered!"

Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday nights, spoke in a school-house in Randolph about two miles from the one in Rootstown. Half a dozen or so of the leaguers went down with me each time, and going back the first night, we all got lost in a swamp which we had to cross.

Wednesday afternoon, was in at the Sewing Circle a few minutes. Thirteen present. Obtained the names of all of them to a petition for the secession of Ohio from the bloody Union.

Sunday afternoon and evening, spoke at the cross roads in Marlborough. Had some opposition from a member of the Disciple church, who thought the reason why the abolitionists had no greater success, was because they did not give God the glory, and did not have Christ for their chairman. A Comeouter in the congregation asked him who the chairman in *his church* was. This was a poser. He dared not say Christ was, "but if the church was what it ought to be"—"that's not what I asked you; who's the chairman of your church as she *now is*? I don't want any of your *if's*." He tried to evade the question three or four times, but the comeouter held him to it. Finally, the necessity of his position, (having made it so strong an objection to the abolitionists, that Christ was not the chairman of *their* societies,) drove him to stammer out "why Christ is," at which they all laughed, for it was notorious that the most prominent man in the church was old Bill Hatcher, of New Baltimore, the greatest Taylor man in all the region.

JOSEPH TREAT.

FRIEND EDITORS:

As your paper appears to advocate the doctrine of equal rights, we claim the privilege of the columns, to correct some false statements made by Hiram Rigg, in reference to a meeting recently held in the village of Middleton. He first declares in his article, that the Friends here, do not understand the first rudiments of reform. Now whether he means, Slavery, Intemperance and War; or whether he means, they do not deny the Old Testament Scriptures, as being the word of God, as he has openly acknowledged and boldly affirmed, we are unable to ascertain. But one thing is certain, that the discipline of the Friends is opposed to Slavery, Intemperance, and War, and claims the Old Testament Scriptures, as the word of God. (1) And there is no ecclesiastical body that has done more for the Slave, than the Friends. (2) Our friend says they can discuss Wilberism and Gurneyism, to their heart's content; but I ask is not this their ecclesiastical matter, and not political. (3)

Again; he says, that William Shaw and Elwood Chapman, would not suffer him to put notices of that meeting on their doors, because the Disunionists were Infidels. This, we think, was a good reason. For proof we only have to call the public to Mr. Rigg's own language on this subject, and what was that? He most unquivocally declared that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Patriarchs, and Prophets are in Hell, unless they repented on a death bed. (4) He also says that Richard H. Beason, denied him the same privilege, and assigns the reason, that the people here, were opposed to an Anti-Slavery meeting, in the place; but we affirm, that this was not the reason. Richard H. Beason offered to aid all he could, in getting up an Anti-Slavery meeting, in the place; but if Mr. Rigg, was a sample of that party, if that party held similar doctrines, the people wanted none of it. Again Mr. Rigg, says, he was informed that Daniel Mercer, offered 25 cents, to assist in tarring and feathering Abby Foster, if she ever came in this region again. This was not the fact, he never offered that sum for that purpose. (1) Now put *that* and *that* together and see how *It* will gingle. Therefore the saddle must be thrown upon Mr. Rigg, until he clears up the matter.

Again he says, their was one friend of humanity, in the place, in whose house the meeting was held namely, Isaac James; but permit us the privilege to say that Isaac James, never offered his house for that meeting, neither did he want a meeting of that kind there. His wife however gave a grant to that effect. (5) In regard to the window glass, Isaac James, says, their was none broken. (7) But let me ask Mr. Rigg, if their was not another house offered in the village, for that meeting? We know their was, and one that was quite as large and convenient, as that the meeting was held in. The idea that Mr. Rigg wishes to convey, is that their was but one friend of humanity in the place. But let us say with few exceptions the inhabitants of Middleton and vicinity, are Anti-Slavery, though it is true we may differ in political action to some extent. But we never can go with a party that denies the word of God, as that party does. (8) They tell us that Moses and the Prophets, never were divinely inspired, when they wrote the Old Testament Scriptures. (9) But we think we can prove the authenticity of Christianity from the moral character of Moses and the Prophets. Every candid mind must acknowledge that there is much depending on the moral character of those who profess to have received a revelation from God, and left on record the same for the consideration and benefit of mankind, for it is reasonable that an infinitely wise and good being, would cause the streams of life to flow down to man thro' as pure channels, as the nature of the case would require. And we are informed that even Angels, on some occasions were sent to earth, on errands of salvation. But God's most ordinary manner of speaking to man, has been through his fellow men, whose moral characters were ever in accordance with the morality of that religion they preached to others, and who were quallified by the Almighty to make known his will to the nations of the Earth. Moses, the Jewish law giver, in all his acts, presents an illustrious moral character, he faithfully discharged the trust reposed in him, and totally forgetting himself and his own secular interest with that also of his family, he labored incessantly to promote God's honor, and the people's welfare, which on many occasions he showed, were dearer to him than his own life.—Moses was in every respect a great man, for every virtue that constitutes genuine nobility, was concentrated in his mind, and displayed in his conduct. He ever conducted himself as a man conscious of his own integrity, and of the guidance and protection of Heaven.

He therefore betrays no confusion in his views, nor indecision in his manners. He was ever without anxiety, because he was conscious of the rectitude of his motives, and that the cause which he had espoused was the cause of God, and that his power and faithfulness were pledged for his support.—His courage and fortitude were unshaken and unconquerable, because his reliance was unremittingly fixed on the unchangeableness of Jehovah. He left Egypt, having an eye to the recompense of reward in another world, and never lost sight of that grand object. He was, therefore, neither discouraged by difficulties, nor elated by prosperity. His refusing to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and thereby removing the claim he had on the treasures and glory of Egypt, proves that he was not influenced by the secular views in the government of the miserable multitudes which he led out of that country. Egypt, too, was possessed of great natural advantages; yet, after a long course of grandeur, and in contradiction to its natural advantages, the prophet Ezekiel prophesied that the kingdom should "be the basest of all kingdoms," and that there should be "no more a prince of the land of Egypt." So the event has been, and so it remains; and that this wonderful prophecy should be passed over by Infidels in silence, is deeply characteristic of their minds. It is not for the want of evidence that the word of God is rejected by them. The evil is not the want of Light, but the love of Darkness. (10)

Yours for the Slave, and Friend of the Bible,

JOHN TREGO.

(1) The *Discipline* is opposed! Suppose it is. Hiram Rigg said nothing about the Discipline; it was the Friends themselves against whom his charges were brought, and not their articles of government. Are the Friends opposed to Slavery, Intemperance and War? Those who know how unanimously they sustained at the ballot-box the most noted *warrior* and SLAVEHOLDER of this country, conferring upon him the highest political honor the nation could bestow, will be able to judge to a fraction how much their anti-war and anti-slavery professions are worth under such circumstances; as to Temperance, we have yet to learn that Friends, either in their Discipline or practice give any evidence that they have yet discovered that Total Abstinence is Temperance, and that nothing short of this deserves the name.

(2) Very true; but "has done," is something very different from *is doing*. What are Friends *doing* for the slave? We know what they are doing for the slaveholder, and should be glad to learn they are doing even half as much for his victims.

(3) Is not the rightfulness of slavery, and the means for its abolition moral questions? and should they not therefore be made subjects for ecclesiastical action? No one questions the right of Friends to discuss Wilberism and Gurneyism; but if they prefer this to doing the works of righteousness, to freeing the captive, and binding up the wounds of them that are bruised, they must not be surprised if others, because of such preference, regard their inward light as rather dim.

(4) Even if H. R. said this, it does not prove that Disunionists are infidels, and we never knew of a more futile attempt to substantiate such a charge, and more especially when we remember it was well known that one of the speakers for whom the meeting was appointed *is in good and regular standing in the Salem meeting of* (*Orthodox*) *Friends!* Here are ten thousand Disunionists, we will say, scattered over the various States; not one in a hundred of them ever heard of Hiram Rigg, and those who have, are probably most of them as ignorant of his views on Theology as we are; and we know nothing of them, and do not care to know for they no more form a part of his anti-slavery, than do the views we hold of astronomy form a part of our anti-slavery. Wendell Phillips, the originator of the Disunion doctrine, we have been informed is a rigid Calvinist; will John Trego therefore contend that the Disunionists are rigid Calvinists? He might with much more plausibility than say the foolish thing he has asserted.

(5) Does J. T. speak by authority? If so, we are glad to correct the error fallen into by the informant of Hiram Rigg.

(6) All honor to the woman then. We presume her husband does not consider such a mistake, so griveous to him as to demand a public correction; but as J. T. thinks otherwise, he is at liberty to make it. We trust the believing wife may save the unbelieving husband.

(7) H. R. does not say there was, but merely that the boys were encouraged to do it.

(8) Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

(9) Another falsehood. We demand proof of the truth of this assertion, or a retraction of the charge; *and we mean what we say.*—The Bugle is the organ of the Disunionists in the West, and during the time it has been published, its editors have frequently presented in its columns *all* the principles of that party; our files are at the service of J. T. for the collection of proof.

(10) These theological views may all be very good and very true, but they contain nothing in proof of the infidelity of Disunionists. We never heard of an anti-slavery party, that either denied or affirmed them; for abolitionists, as such, have no more to do with these matters in their efforts against slavery than they have with Grahamism or anti-Grahamism, Millerism or anti-Millerism. Indeed neither these views nor their opposites have any rightful claim to insertion in an anti-slavery paper, and had they come from a Disunionist we should have refused them place, and only give them now because