teach and to illustrate, for the benefit of mankind a higher and better civilization than they have hitherto known? If the Congress of the United States shall persist in this attempt, then they shall at least allow me to predict its results. Either you will not establish African Slavery in Kansas, or you will do it at the cost of the sacrifice of the the existing liberties of the American people. Even if slavery were, what it is not, a boon to the people of Kansas, they would reject it if enforced upon their acceptance by Federal guns. The attempt is in conflict with all the tendencies of the age. African slavery has, for the last fifty years, been giving way, as well in this country as in the Islands and on the main land throughout this hemisphere. The political power and prestige of slavery in the United States are passing away. The slave States practically governed the Union directly for fifty years. They govern it now, only indirectly, through the agency of Northern hands, temporarily enlisted in their support. So much, owing to the decline of their power, they have already conceded to the free States. The next step, if they persist in their present course, will be the resumption and exercise by the free States of the control of the government, without such concessions as they have hitherto made to obtain it. Throughout a period of nearly twenty years, the defenders of slavery screened it from discussion in the national councils. Now, they practically confess to the necessity for defending it here, by initiating discussion themselves. They have at once thrown away their most successful weapon, compromise, and worn out that one which was next in effectiveness, threats of secession from the Union. It is under such inauspicious circumstances that they begin the new experiment of extending slavery into free territory by force, the armed power of the Federal Government. You will need many votes from free States in the House of Representatives, and even some votes from those States in this House, to send an army with a retinue of slaves in its train into Kansas. Have you counted up your votes in the two Houses? Have you calculated how long those who shall cast such votes will retain their places in the National Legislature?

But I will grant, for the sake of the argument, that with Federal battalions you can carry slavery into Kansas, and maintain it there. Are you quite confident that this republican form of government can then be upheld and preserved? You will then yourselves have introduced the Trojan horse. No republican government ever has endured, with standing armies maintained in its bosom to enforce submission to its laws. A people who have once learned to relinquish their rights, under compulsion, will not be long in forgetting that they ever had any. In extending slavery into Kansas, therefore, by arms, you will subvert the liberties of the people.

Senators of the free States, I appeal to you. Believe ye the prophets? I know you do. You know, then, that Slavery neither works mines and quarries, nor founds cities, nor builds ships, nor levies armies, nor mans navies. Why, then, will you insist on closing up this new Territory of Kansas against all enriching streams of immigration, while you pour into it the turbid and poisonous waters of African Slavery? Which one of you all, whether of Connecticut, or of Pennsylvania, or of Illinois, or of Michigan, would consent thus to extinguish the chief light of civilization within the State in which your own fortunes are cast, and in which your own posterity are to live? Why will you pursue a policy so unkind, so ungenerous, and so unjust, towards the helpless, defenseless struggling Territory of Kansas, inhabited as it is by your own brethren, depending on you for protection and safety? Will Slavery in Kansas add to the wealth or power of your own States, or to the wealth, power or glory of the Republic? You know that it will diminish all of these. You profess a desire to end this national debate about slavery, which has become, for you, intolerable. Is it not time to relinquish that hope? You have exhausted the virtue, for that purpose, that resided in compacts and platforms, in the suppression of the right of petition and in arbitrary parliamentary laws, in abnegation of Federal authority over the subject of Slavery within the National Territories. Will you even then end the debate, by binding Kansas with chains, for the safety of Slavery in Missouri? Even then you must give over Utah to Slavery, to make it secure and permanent in Kansas; and you must give over Oregon and Washington to both Polygamy and Slavery, so as to guaranty equally the one and the other of those peculiar domestic institutions in Utah; and so you must go on, sacrificing on the shrine of peace Territory after Territory, until the prevailing nationality of freedom and of virtue shall be lost, and the vicious anomalies, which you have hitherto vainly hoped Almighty Wisdom would remove from among you without your own concurrence, shall become the controlling elements in the Republic. He who found a river in his path, and sat down to wait for the flood to pass away, was not more unwise than he who expects the agitation of Slavery to cease while the love of Freedom animates the bosoms of mankind.

The solemnity of the occasion draws over our heads the cloud of disunion, which always arises whenever the subject of Slavery is agitated. Still the debate goes on, more ardently, earnestly, and angrily, than ever before. It employs now not merely logic, reproach, menace, retort, and defiance, but sabres, rifles, and cannon. Do you look through this incipient war quite to the end, and see there peace, quiet and harmony, on the subject of Slavery? If so, pray enlighten me, and show me how lon; the way is which leads to that repose. The free States are loyal, and they always will remain so. Their foothold on this Continent is firm and sure. Their ability to maintain themselves, unaided, under the present Constitution, is established. The Slave States also have been loyal hitherto, and I hope and trust they ever may remain so. But if disunion could ever come, it would come in the form of a secession of the slaveholding States; and it would come then when the slaveholding power, which is already firmly established on the Gulf of Mexico, and extends a thousand miles northward along both banks of the Mississippi, should have fixed its grappling irons upon the fountains of the Missouri and the slopes of the Rocky Mountains. Then that power would either be intolerably supreme in this Republic, or it would strike for independence or exclusive domination. Then the free States and slaves States of the Atlantic, divided and warring with each other, would disgust the free States of the Pacific, and they would have abundant cause and justification for withdrawing from a Union productive no longer of peace, safety and liberty to themselves, and no longer holding up the cherished hopes of mankind.

Mr. President, the Continental Congress of 1787, on resigning the trust, which it had discharged with signal fidelity, into the hands of the authorities elected under the New Constitution, and in taking leave of their constituents, addressed to the people of the United States this memorable injunction: "Let it never be forgotten that the cause of the United States has always been the cause of human nature.' Let us recall that precious monition—let us examine the ways which we have pursued hitherto under the light thrown upon them by that instruction. We shall find in doing so that we have forgotten moral right in the pursuit of material greatness, and we shall cease henceforth from practising upon ourselves the miserable delusion that we can safely extend empire when we shall have become reckless of the obligations of eternal justice, and faithless to the interests of universal freedom.

LET HIM OUT.—Senator BUTLER, of South Carlina, in a late speech before the Senate, said; "If an insulting interference were to be made by a majority of Congress, or such an interference as would exclude a slaveholder on the broad ground that he was unworthy of equality, with a non-slaveholding population, do you suppose I would stay in the Union—if I could get out of it?"—It is such blustering nonsense as this that scares the Black Democracy, and makes them get down on their knees and implore the patriotic citizens of South Carolina not to destroy the Union. If the language of Mr. Butler means anything, it means this—that he would not stay in the Union if its laws exclude slavery from any part of it. Now, this ferocious man remained in the Union almost all his days while its laws excluded slavery from most of its public territory. The laws of 1787, and of 1820, were both in operation during his lifetime; yet he remained in the Union! And both he and South Carolina would stay in it if slavery were excluded from every inch of our public territory. They *will* remain in it; and such will be the decision of the people, in spite of the Black Democracy. Whatever may be the cost, slavery shall go no farther; nor shall the Union be dissolved.—*Leader.*

SLAVERY AND THE CONITITUTION.

On our first page will be found Mr. Granger's speech in the House of Representatives, taking the unusual ground for that place, that there is no slavery in the Federal Constitution. Mr. Garrison in the last Liberator reviews and criticises the doctrine of the speech in the following article:

SLAVERY AND THE CONSTITUTION.

In the U. S. House of Representatives, on the 14th inst., the Hon. A. P. Granger, of Western New York, made a speech, in which he took the ground, that 'slavery in the United States is unconstitutional, and therefore unlawful'—repeating, almost word for word, the arguments (?) in support of that position advanced by Messrs. Smith, Goodell, and others. Soaring on the wings of his imagination, he exclaimed, 'Sir, if this glorious republican Constitution of this glorious land of liberty, (!) the asylum of the oppressed, (!!) this home of the brave and this land of the free, (!!!) takes sides with slavery, then I confess I do not understand it. Sir, the Constitution, both in spirit and express terms, repudiates slavery, and positively bars its existence.' No one appears to have deemed it worth while to reply to this speech, its historical absurdity being so transparent, and its verbal criticism so superficial and contradictory. But, conceding its assumption to be the true rendering of that instrument, let us see what will be among the consequences that will follow:—

1. There has never been a constitutional Congress, and all laws passed at the present, or at any preceding session of the spurious conclave, convened annually at Washington, are illegal, null, and void.

2. As Gen. Granger is not entitled to a seat in any unconstitutional House of Representatives, by recognizing the present Congress as valid, he either puts his foot upon his own theory, as utterly untenable, or else connives at the overthrow of the instrument he has sworn to maintain; for there are upwards of twenty representatives in Congress from the slave States, representing three-fifths of the slave population—constituting an oligarchy more to be abhorred and dreaded than any order of nobility in Europe. "It is claimed,' he said, 'that the three-fifths of all other persons means slaves. Then, why not say so?' Our reply to this verbal trifling is, if the clause referred to does not mean slaves, why does Gen. Granger retain his seat in a body unknown to the Constitution?

3. All judicial decisions upon the acts of the various Congresses, from the adoption of the Constitution to the present time, recognizing them as legal, and all executive proceedings, are, like those acts, of no binding force whatever.

4. The Government of the United States yet remains to be organized! *We are ruled by conspirators and usurpers!*

5. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Pinckney, Wythe, Marshall, Carroll of Carrollton, and their slaveholding associates, were a lawless band, lost to all shame, and anarchists in the guise of patriotism, in first framing and adopting an anti-slavery Constitution, and then continuing to hold half a million of slaves (now numbering four millions) in hopeless bondage—impudently talking of pro-slavery compromises that (according to Gen. Granger) were never made! Why were they not arrested, and brought to justice?

6. From 1789 to 1856, the people of this country have never understood their own Constitution!—They have persisted in interpreting it, on the subject of slavery, diametrically opposite to what they intended from the beginning! They have understood black to mean white, and white to black! They allowed the foreign slave trade to be prosecuted for a score of years under the national flag, blunderingly supposing that was a part of the compact! They have consented uniformly, and always, to allow the slaveholder to recover his fugitive slave in any part of the compact! They have consented uniformly, and always, to allow the slaveholder to recover his fugitive slave in any part of the Union, forgetting that they utterly abolished slavery in 1789, on the adoption of their 'glorious Consititution'! They have believed that the South is entitled, by that instrument, to a three-fifth slave representation in Congress, when they never dreamed of making any such arrangement! Such wholesale and long-continued stultification, on the part of a people claiming to be intelligent, the world has never seen before—Gen. Granger being witness!

For all these incredible absurdities legitimately follow the declaration, that 'slavery in the United States is unconstitutional, and therefore unlawful.' To outface a nation in this manner is the coolest thing imaginable—parallelled only by the Romish dogma, that because Jesus said, 'Take, eat—this is my body'—therefore the literal body of the Savior is devoured, after the manner of cannibalism, instead of bread!

Gen. Granger effectually answered himself by his contradictions before he finished his speech.—Referring to the article in the Constitution respecting the manner in which representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States, he said, 'Suppose this relates to slaves: it was merely *a compromise with slavery*, in which, like all other compromises with slavery, freedom gets cheated. With an understanding that the public burdens would be borne, or taxes paid by the slave States, in proportion to their representation in Congress, the slave States obtained, and now possess, the unfair advantage of some twenty-one members of Congress, and an equal number of presidential electors more than a fair share, while they have long since ceased to furnish a dollar in consideration of the arrangement.' And so the anti-slavery Constitution is blown to atoms!—'Suppose it relates to slaves':—but how can such a compromise be admitted, without refuting the assertion that slavery is unconstitutional and illegal? '*Merely* a compromise':—but what said John Quincy Adams respecting it?—'It was the exaction, fatal to the principle of popular representation; of a representation for slaves—for articles of merchandize, under the name of persons; . . . thereby to make the preservation, propagation and perpetuation of slavery the vital and animating spirit of the national government.' Gen. Granger says, 'The slave States meet us at every Presidential election with some twenty-one extra electoral votes, for all which they pay not a farthing of the stipulated consideration.' Here he admits that a bargain was made, in the formation of the Constitution, by which the slave States were to be allowed a representation for their slaves, for a pecuniary consideration. But how could this be, if slavery was annihilated by the Constitution? The contradiction is palpable.

Again—referring to Sec. 9, Art. 1, 'The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited prior to 1808,' he says, without making any denial, 'This is claimed by some to be a recognition of the slave trade. If it was, it was a recognition with a vengeance: it was to put an end to it.' Not to put an end to it, however, until the expiration of twenty years; nor even then, if Congress should not feel disposed to pass a prohibitory law. But how preposterous it is to insist that the Constitution, on its adoption, made slavery illegal, and yet admit that it provided for the prosecution of the foreign slave trade until the year 1808!

Of the section which reads, 'No person held to service or labor,' &c., Gen. G. says, 'That it means slavery, I deny.' But what is his denial worth against the unbroken, uniform, and universal interpretation of it by THE NATION for more than sixty years? John Quincy Adams says emphatically, 'It cannot be denied that the slaveholding lords of the South *prescribed it as a condition of their assent to the Constitution*,' though it was 'an engagement positively prohibited by the laws of God, delivered from Sinai.' Did not Mr. Adams know whereof he affirmed? The engagement is still a part of the instrument, having never been repealed or modified. What is to be gained by such verbal quibbling? Can it be reconciled with straight-forward honesty and fair dealing? Besides, if Gen. Granger is right, and John Quincy Adams wrong in this matter, because the word SLAVE is not found in Section 2d, Art. 4, then it is absurd to talk of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1793 or of 1850, and to expatiate upon its enormities; because it may be as boldly and truthfully declared, that no such Law has ever been enacted by Congress, but only an unexceptionable Law expressed in *the very language of the Constitution!* If the one is anti-slavery, so is the other. But what would be thought of the intelligence or honesty of the man who should insist that Congress has never yet passed a Fugitive Slave Law, because the word slave is not mentioned therein?

The way in which slavery is proved to be unconstitutional is as follows:—

'No title of nobility shall be granted'—'No bill of attainder shall be passed'—'No State shall pass any bill impairing the obligation of contracts'—'The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended in time of peace'—'The United States shall guarantee to every State a republican form of government'—'No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law'—'We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, to establish justice . . . and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain this Constitution':—*therefore*, slavery is unconstitutional.—'These are direct and positive prohibitions of slavery,' says Gen. Granger, 'cutting it up root and branch.'

But, as a contract is binding only in the sense in which it was understood and recognized by the parties making it—as the language of the Constitution is to be interpreted in the light of history, and in view of the circumstances under which it was formed—the all-sufficient reply to these quotations is, that they were never designed or understood to interfere with the institution of slavery, directly or indirectly, but had reference to such only as were free; therefore, to construe them in any other manner, to apply them in a way never contemplated, is to be guilty of fraud, and to act upon the jesuitical maxim that the end sanctifies the means. That the passages referred to were not regarded as at all impairing the right of any slaveholder to his slave is evident, beyond a reasonable doubt—

1. Because not a slave was ever set free by any such construction of the Constitution.

2. Because a slave representation in Congress was treated as a constitutional provision *from the beginning.*

3. Because the foreign slave trade was universally regarded as sacred, *under the constitution*, against any governmental interference for its abolition until the year 1808.

4. Because the fugitive slave law of 1793 demonstrated, promptly and conclusively, what was intended by the section, 'No person held to service or labor,' &c.

5. Because, if slavery was made illegal by the Constitution, it is incredible that such men as Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Marshall, Jay and Franklin, lived all their days ignorant of so momentous a fact.

6. Because, if this was so, it is equally incredible that the people as electors, and the senators and representatives as their servants, and every court appointed by them from the highest to the lowest, state and national, for almost seventy years should never have understood their own Constitution and form of government.

7. Because the intelligent adoption of a Constitution intended to 'cut up slavery, root and branch,' presupposes a radical change in the views and feelings of the people on the subject of slavery, and they regarded it as under all circumstances a sin against God, and an outrage upon man; whereas, it is notorious, that the right to hold slaves was every where conceded, and is at this day stoutly maintained by a very large majority of the people.

8. Because immediate and unconditional emancipation is a modern doctrine; while the most that was aimed at, in the days of Washington, by any scheme, was a gradual abolition, 'half way between now and never.'

9. Because every one of the thirteen States, except Massachusetts, adopting the Constitution, tolerated slavery on its soil at that time; and not one of them regarded that instrument as interfering with its right to continue to hold slaves, *ad libitum.*

10. Because slavery had an existence in the colonies for more than a century and a half—gradually extending itself, and increasing the number of its victims till it reached half a million at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. Now, to say that a system so old, and so interwoven with all the religious, political, social and pecuniary habits of the people, was crushed without a struggle, and that 'property' so valuable was voluntarily sacrificed by its possessors, is simply preposterous.

11. Because Africans and their descendants, in this country, have been treated with systematic injustice and oppression, as an inferior and leprous race, from the settlement of the country; hence, it was not possible for those who despised and enslaved them to take them to their embrace as equals in the formation of the government—but it was natural and inevitable for them to exclude this hated and outraged class from equal rights and privileges—and, accordingly, they did so; hence, the pro-slavery compromises in the Constitution.

12. Because, since the world was created, it has never been known for tyrants, possessing unlimited power over the lives and liberties of others,—and especially the worst of all tyrants, slaveholders,—as a body, to relinquish their grasp, and proclaim freedom to their vassals, without entreaty or hesitancy, without discussion or agitation, and without necessity or recompense. Certainly, no such thing was done by the colonial slaveholders, either on the adoption of the Constitution or prior to that time; therefore, the assertion, that that instrument 'cuts slavery up, root and branch,' has no foundation whatever, but is disproved by evidence wholly insurmountable.

Here we have given a dozen reasons, each one of which is incontrovertible, we think, proving that an anti-slavery construction of the Constitution is a fraud, on the one hand and is giving credit to whom credit is *not* due, on the other. For it is *not* true that our fathers resolutely set their faces against chattel slavery, and determined to give it no quarter in their national compact: on the contrary, it *is* true that, to effect a union of the colonies, and to prevent their own possible subjection by the mother country, through their divisions, they made 'a covenant with death and an agreement with hell,' though not without some twinges of conscience and feelings of shame. Our duty is not to deny or to hide their guilt, but to confess it with sorrow, and to refuse to be participators therein.

It is mere parrot-talk, therefore, to be repeating the various clauses of the Constitution relating to a title of nobility, to bills of attainder, to impairing the obligation of contracts, to the writ of habeas corpus, &c., &c. They break no fetter; they emancipate no slave; they were not adopted in order to 'cut slavery up, root and branch'—no, not even to interfere with the growth of a single twig thereof. As if this tremendous struggle, which is shaking the republic to its foundations, were a question of grammar, or to be decided by an ingenious interpretation! As if the representatives of the people, and the people themselves, have been ignorant of the relation of the Constitution to chattel slavery for more than three score years! Away with such childish folly, and up with the banner whereon is inscribed the motto, 'NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!'

From Fred. Douglas' Paper.

THE CHIVALRY REFUSE WESTERN RESERVE CHEESE.

In Cincinnati may be found the gentlemanly and fair dealing firm of Straight & Deming, dealers in groceries, prime W. R. cheese, and other matters in the same line, too numerous to mention. Prompted no doubt by the good qualities of their cheese, and the fair terms of sale offered by those gentlemen, a number of Southern merchants, all unknowing the risks they ran were in the habit of dealing with them. Now it must also be known that Mr. Straight is of a philanthropic turn; on subscription lists for soup houses, Relief Unions, and Orphan Asylums, his name may generally be found, nor did he confine his philanthropic demonstrations to the white race alone; the human brotherhood of the despised negro was also regarded. It came also in time that the heart of Mr. Straight was aroused by the heroic conduct, and the mournful fate of the poor desperate slave mother Margaret Garner. And when, in spite of the vaunted State sovereignty of Ohio, she was dragged by Marshal Robinson, and his drunken myrmidons, to slavery, he united with others in presenting a purse to Mr. Joliffe as a token of their appreciation of his efforts in her behalf.

This deed came to the ears of the aforesaid Southern merchants, and a pithy correspondence ensued in which they asked if the gentlemanly dealing Mr. Straight, whom they knew, was the same Straight who was affording aid and comfort to the abolitionist Joliffe? To this answer was returned as gentle as might be, but avowing the identity of their Mr. Straight with the abolitionist Straight.

The Southerners then demand a statement of accounts, and avowed their intention to refuse dealing further with the firm. They further administered some gratuitous advice concerning the poor to be found in Cincinnati. On that score our friends needed no exhortation, as the managers of the benevolent institutions of the city can testify. The grand difference between the Anti-Slavery men and the supporters of slavery, is, that while they are not indifferent to the hardships and wrongs peculiar to free society, they can at the same time see and labor for the reform of the errors of slave society. The slave owner sees only the mistakes of free society, nor seeks to alleviate them.

But if our Southern friends will not buy cheese of Straight & Deming, of whom will they purchase? It is not to be supposed that any firm can be found servile enough to advertise Reserve cheese and Southern principles, then there is again danger of being taken in again by Abolitionists, who sell the best qualities at moderate rates. Or suppose them to go at once to the producers; the fact is notorious that the Western Reserve numbers among its natural productions, cream cheese and abolitionists. We see no help for them except totally abstaining from the use of cheese, for the chances are that all cheese made, is redolent of Abolitionism. The principle must not be carried too far, however, lest they should find themselves with no clothes to their backs, shoes to their feet, or worse than all, no whips, thumb-screws or manacles, wherewith to drive and maim their unfortunate slaves.

SLAVE LAW IN CUBA.

The mildness of the Spanish slave-code in comparison with that of the United States is proverbial. An illustration is seen in a fact of recent occurrence in Cuba, where several slaves, having obtained a sum of money by robbery, used it to purchase their freedom. According to Spanish law, these men, though liable to severe punishment for the robbery, can never be again reduced to slavery. Their liberty, though paid for with stolen money, is henceforth their sovereign and unquestioned right. A correspondent of the *Tribune* writing from Havana, gives another illustration of the working of this same law.—*Standard.*

"A negro slave had been condemned, by order of the Court, to be sold at public auction to pay the expenses of his trial for some trivial offence, his owner having given him up to avoid the responsibility. The bidding commenced and the price was soon run up to $400, and the poor fellow was about to be handed over to the highest bidder, when he interrupted the auctioneer by saying that he would give that amount himself for his liberty. The Alcalde immediately stopped the sale and ordered the man's free papers to be made out in due form. It was soon done and the money paid over. The negro seized the document and was just about to leave the court, when he was rearrested under the charge of having stolen $500 from a shopkeeper who lived outside of the walls. The Alcalde kindly expressed his sympathy for the unfortunate haberdasher, and told him that his money was lost forever, and that the only thing he could do would be to remand the negro to jail. This was done, and the man was subsequently condemned to twelve months' hard labor in the chain-gang. I have frequently seen him, since the expiration of his term of punishment, working on the wharf as stevedore. These facts need no comments. I hope they may meet the eyes of some of your Southern readers, who lay so much claim to Christian feelings, for even they may learn a lesson of wisdom from Spanish legislators. I have heard several Southern gentlemen say that if they ever got hold of Cuba they would soon change the slavery system. Yes, I suppose they would introduce the barbarous laws they have inherited from their ancestors, with a few modern improvements thereon! I am much afraid that their very humane wishes will never be gratified. Abolitionism is gaining ground even in Cuba. The planters see by experience that they can get along very well without slave labor, if it is only possible to substitute the Asiatics. Several very wealthy and intelligent sugar-growers near Cardenas, Mantanzas, and Puerto Principe, are offering the best inducements to white laborers to come and settle on their estates and cultivate a certain amount of land on shares. Many have responded to the call, and I shall soon have the pleasure of presenting to your readers some highly-interesting information on this all-important subject."

From the Liberator.

ONE WHO GLORIES IN RUFFIANISM.

SYLVANIA, GA., April 16, 1856.

DEAR SIR: Your abolition friend travelling in Georgia last winter did not, it seems, receive kind and courteous treatment from his travelling companion, Edmondson, of Atalanta, as I see from his letter published originally in your paper, and since republished in some of the Georgia papers, as something very funny. Such, sir, is the treatment a cursed abolitionist will always receive in *'this slavery-cursed region.'* I don't think Edmondson ought to have killed your friend, as he threatened to do; but I assure you, sir, he would have met with no opposition if he had made the negroes tie and whip him, as he again threatened to do. Such a proceeding would have been a treat to the negroes, a feeling lesson for your friend, and a solemn warning to future offenders. Believe me, sir, Edmondson acted humanely, under the circumstances.

Sir, we have the greatest country that Heaven in its beneficence ever smiled upon—brave men and fair women; and your abolition friend published a vile slander when he wrote that the people of the South were a tobacco-chewing, whiskey-drinking, profane, immoral people. Our negroes, too, are contented and happy. They have good homes; they never suffer for food, as do the free blacks of the North. They are more religious, too. They are fat and jolly, love their masters, and hate an Abolitionist as they do the devil.

You, sir, and your coadjutors, will dissolve this Union of States;—a Union that I have loved as much as I did my native Georgia, and still could but for such as you. Your labors, sir, will result in the overthrow and ruin of our matchless system of government. You are, in short, sir—Beecher and all—a set of damned fanatical and hypocritical fools, and will never get an adequate renumeration for your iniquities till you get down to that place not to be mentioned to ears polite.

I have written these lines in much haste, as the mail soon closes. I hope you will put them in your paper, and preach a sermon from them to your friends; but this I do not believe you will do.

BENJ. L. PRESCOTT,
Attorney and Counsellor at Law.

W. L. GARRISON, Boston Liberator, }
Boston, Mass. }

MISERY IN NEW YORK.

The Committee of the New York Legislature, who recently examined the dwellings of the poorest classes in the city of New York, ask legislation to prevent the evils that met them in their searching investigation, and give details of misery and wretchedness too sickening to dwell upon. In one house they found a hundred and twelve families, numbering eight or ten each—breathing an atmosphere redolent of disease and putridity, huddled indiscriminately in damp, foul cellars, to breathe the air of which is to inhale disease. "Here," say the committee, "in their very worst aspect, are to be seen the horrors of such a mode of living.—Here are to be found drunken and diseased adults of both sexes lying in the midst of their filth; idiotic and crippled children suffering from neglect and ill treatment; girls, just springing into womanhood, living indiscriminately in the same apartment with men of all ages and of all colors; babies left so destitute of care and nourishment as to be fitted only for a jail or hospital in after years, if they escape the blessing of an early grave. Indeed, no language could faithfully depict the suffering and misery witnessed even in the hurried visits paid by the Committee to these hotbeds of immorality, drunkenness, debauchery and disease." They think "it is no idle assertion to say that a reform by which the condition of the homes of the poor could be improved would remove a large proportion of the criminals from our prisons and the paupers from our almshouses. In London since the model lodging houses have been in existence, together with baths and washouses for the poor, the morality has decreased thirty one per cent., and pauperism thirty-nine per cent. A similar result would attend a similar reform in New York."

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

SALEM, OHIO, MAY 3, 1856.

TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY!!

The Twenty-Third Public Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held at the CITY ASSEMBLY ROOMS (No. 446 Broadway, between Howard and Grand sts.,) in the City of New York, on WEDNESDAY, May 7th, at 10 o'clock A. M., and will be continued at the same place during the remainder of the day, and on THURSDAY, 9th. Addresses are expected from WM. LLOYD GARRISON, WENDELL PHILLIPS, Rev. THEODORE PARKER, Mrs. LUCY STONE BLACKWELL, of Cincinnati, Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, of Syracuse, and others to be hereafter announced.

As full an attendance of the members and friends of the Society as practicable, from all parts of the country, is earnestly desired and stongly urged.

We reiterate our former declaration, that the object of the society is not *merely* to make "Liberty national and Slavery sectional"—nor to prevent the acquisition of Cuba—nor to restore the Missouri Compromise—nor to repeal the Fugitive Slave bill—nor to make Kansas a free State—nor to resist the admission of any slave State into the Union—nor to terminate slavery in the District of Columbia and in the National Territories—but it is, primarily, comprehensively, and uncompromisingly, to effect the immediate, total and eternal overthrow of Slavery, wherever it exists on American soil, and to expose and confront whatever party or sect seeks to purchase peace or success at the expense of human liberty. Living or dying, our motto is "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS, RELIGIOUSLY OR POLITICALLY!"

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.

EDMUND QUINCY, }
S. H. GAY, } Secretaries.

THE HUMILIATION OF OHIO.

As a matter of course, Judge Leavitt of the Federal District Court, has released Marshal Robinson from imprisonment. Thus adding another to the series of acts of subjugation and humiliation of the Government of Ohio. *The Kidnapper is King*, Supreme on our Soil, and the fugitive law is above all other authority. While our people are crying themselves hoarse against the introduction of slavery into Kansas, it is fast becoming thoroughly established in Ohio. The most decisive step towards this result, is the nullification of our State Judiciary This has been effectually accomplished by the Federal Court. Judge McLean took the first important step in the Rosetta case. Judge Leavitt followed it up in his decision that the Commissioner's warrant for the return of fugitives must take precedence of the criminal courts of the State, as well as of the writ of Habeas Corpus issued by the Probate Judge, Burgoyne, and now he has completed the work by taking the Marshal out of the hands of the Sheriff, as he before took the alleged criminals out of his hands, and has insulted and trodden down the authority of the Probate Court as no authority whatever, when it comes in the way of slave catching. And when Governor Chase, in the ordinary discharge of his executive duty, comes in and claims the deported criminals, he too is taunted, mocked by the successful kidnapper Gaines.

Let any one answer, where is now the power of Ohio to protect the liberties of her citizens? Where is the authority of her State Courts? What is now in Ohio the value of the boasted writ of Habeas Corpus. The Marshal may defy it, and so may any of the hundreds of deputies whom he may appoint at will. The federal court will defend and protect them.

This we presume is the end of the case, Judge Burgoyne will probably take no steps for vindicating the authority of his Court. He should do it. He should send Judge Leavitt to keep company with the Marshal in jail and Ohio should sustain him in it. But our vaunting State will submit. She is well characterised by the old Patriarch, Israel's dying though doubtful "blessing" of his son Issachar.

"Issachar is a strong ass, crouching down between two burdens: *And he saw that rest was good and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear and became a servant unto tribute.*"

Just so, do our people for the sake of rest ("Union") in this pleasant land. Our people will have quiet though they be slaves. They submit to this appaling despotism on their own soil, and attempt to cover their disgrace by shouting against slavery in Kansas.

The Cincinnati Gazette of the 23d ult., gives the following account of Judge Leavitt's decision:

DECISION OF JUDGE LEAVITT IN THE HABEAS CORPUS CASE—MR. ROBINSON DISCHARGED.

Judge Leavitt, yesterday morning, delivered his opinion in this case, which has excited considerable interest in this city for the past week. Mr. Robinson was released from custody, on the ground that, in refusing to obey the order of Judge Burgoyne, he was "acting under the authority of a law of the United States," and in the discharge of his official duties.

We find it impossible to give the opinion of Judge Leavitt, in full, this morning; as we would be glad to do, and are obliged to confine ourselves to a single extract, which, however, contains the substance of his decision. After stating the facts of the case, which have been published from time to time in the city newspapers, and are generally known, he says:

The habeas corpus in this case issued pursuant to the seventh section of the act of Congress, passed March 2, 1833, which provides "that either of the Justices of the Supreme Court, or a Judge of any District Court of the United States, in addition to the authority already conferred by law shall have power to grant writs of habeas corpus in all cases of prisoner or prisoners in jail or confinement, while he or they shall be committed or confined on or by any authority of law, for any act done or omitted to be done in pursuance of a law of the United States, or any order, process or decree of any judge or court thereof, anything in any act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding."

Is it insisted by the council who oppose the discharge of the Marshal, that this provision of the act of Congress applies only to the case of a federal officer who is confined or imprisoned by State authority under an unconstitutional State law; and reference is made to the historical fact, that the act of 1833 was passed to met the then existing exigency growing out of the threatened opposition of one of the States of the Union to the national legislation, for the imposition and collection of duties on imports. To this it may be replied that, whatever may have been the peculiar circumstances under which the act passed, the section above quoted is still in full force and obligatory as a law of the United States. And it may be fairly inferred, that while its purpose was at the date of its passage to provide against a great danger then impending, it has been deemed expedient that it should be continued as a remedy against nullification, in any form in which it might be presented.

But this point is now for the first time presented for decision. It has been settled by eminent judges of the highest official position. In the ex parte Jenkins (II. Wallace jr.'s Rep., 531) Judge Grier, of the Supreme Court of the United States, granted a writ of habeas corpus under the statute referred to, and released the persons who applied for it without the intimation of a doubt as to the authority it conferred. And in the well known Rosetta case, which occurred about a year since, Judge McLean granted a writ of habeas corpus under the same provision of the statute and released the Marshal from custody under circumstances very similar to those involved in the case now before me.

The only inquiry, therefore, arising in the present case is whether from the facts proved, it sufficiently appears that the imprisonment of the Marshal was "for any act done or omitted to be done in pursuance of a law of the United States." If this inquiry is answered affirmatively it will follow that he is entitled to his discharge, the precise case contemplated by the statute in that event is presented.

In the consideration of this question it is not necessary to inquire whether the Probate Judge could rightfully issue the writ of habeas corpus; neither is it necessary that this Court should assert or exercise a power of revising or reviewing the sentence of the Probate Judge for the indefinite imprisonment of the Marshal for the alleged contempt. Indeed such a jurisdiction is distinctly disclaimed. But if the conclusion is warranted, that the judgment against the Marshal was for an act done and omitted in the discharge of official duties, and under the authority of a law of the United States, an obligation is imposed on me from which I cannot shrink.

The remainder of the decision, which is quite long, is argumentative, and principally devoted to the citation and review of authorities which had been quoted by the attorneys in the case, or were relied upon by the Court.

MORE KIDNAPPING IN LAWRENCE CO.

On the night of the 7th inst., at the Tunnel of the Ironton Railroad, Peter Spears and Jonathan B. Maze seized a negro that was travelling along the highway, tied him, and ran him off to Kentucky.

This is not the first act of open and piratical kidnapping that has occurred in this county. We are told that Maze and Spears are both familiar with the business.

Within the past six six years, eight free negroes have been kidnapped in this county, that we know of four of whom are still in slavery. It is time that some effective measures were taken to put a stop to a species of business along our borders that puts us on a level with the barbarous and savage tribes that inhabit the coasts of Africa.

The people of this country will make no objection to the lawful arrest of fugitive slaves, who have escaped; but the nest of black legs and loafers in our midst who for years have been engaged in seizing and running off into slavery every negro that could not show free papers, merely for the sake of gain, ought to be driven out of the community. The act of kidnapping is a penitentiary crime.—*Ironton Times*, (*Dem.*)

Why are not the kidnappers who practice their villainy according to the forms of law as guilty as those who are less nice about these, to the slave, unessential formalities? United States Commissioners and Marshals deserve the penitentiary, morally as much as the villains whom the Ironton Times curses so heartily. Slavery is the great crime, rather than the method of its perpetration. the Bible speaks of iniquity framed by law, as the greatest possible evidence of the guilt of a nation. And so it is. Yet our nation is so besotted by its generations of slaveholding practice, that in its estimation kidnapping and slaveholding are virtues of the highest grade, provided they are practiced according to the forms made and prescribed by Congress.

A VOICE FROM THE SOUTH.

The Charleston S. C. Mercury is one of the advocates of the renomination and election of President Pierce. It discourses of what is desirable at the South in the following style. It is for something effective, for "success—victory—triumph."

It says:

"There will be some hope for the South when our people shall clearly comprehend the great political fact, that no government that ever existed ever did protect the people from the perpetration of its own wrongs, *of its own accord.* Inconsiderable reforms have sometimes been effected without drawing the sword; but thirty-two times in the history of the British empire, has the sword been drawn to force the government to guarantie to the people the rights of Magna Charta. *Revolution in some form, bloodiness or otherwise, is by far the most common, and often the only remedy*, against governmental misrule and tyranny. And the sun of the South will rise again, and shine glorious and bright, whenever our people shall clearly see and know that their dearest and most sacred rights will be protected, defended and preserved *by themselves alone*, and when they shall make the admission, and act upon it, that those rights will be forever lost, if abandoned to the protection of the government at Washington—to the National Democratic party, or any other party, save the party of the people whose rights are in jeopardy. The Government at Washington is, in fact, the greatest enemy we have to dread, and against which our defences should be erected; for that is the power, the force, with which abolition seeks to subjugate us; and to expect protection from our worst enemy, is to reverse and reprobate all the principles and policy of our national and individual action, both in war and individual antagonism. It is even more than this; for to act so unwisely and absurdly, is to abandon the simplest teachings of common sense and common observation, and to exchange positions with the abolitionists, and to become ourselves the madmen.

"We want success—victory—triumph, in Kansas: then, that the languid pulse of the South may be stimulated and quickened—that the people of the South may, in their first act of manly and practical resistance, acquire the *prestige* of future success, and in the only way that success is possible."

THE SUFFRAGE QUESTION.—The Legislature of Ohio has adjourned without doing anything towards extending the privileges of the elective franchise to those who are deprived of it by constitutional provision. Memorials for this purpose were addressed to the Legislature in behalf of the disfranchised women and colored people. Some of the petitions embracing both classes, others one of them. The colored people themselves sent in a memorial, in regard to their case, which was referred to a special committee. So far as we are informed, that Committee never reported at all on the subject. A joint Committee of both houses was appointed to report amendments to the Constitution. They reported several clauses for amendment. But no redress was proposed for the disfranchised. The presidential election was too near at hand, for a majority of republicans to jeopard their prospect of success by advocating or granting *equal rights to all.*