

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE, SALEM, O.

From the *Chronicle*.
Annexation of Cuba.

The Charleston Courier of the 25th has a rather rich development of the hitherto abortive machinations of our slaveholding masters to get possession of Cuba. They went about the matter with great secrecy and stern resolution, but it seems they have managed it with little tact and less success. Last fall the New York Herald announced that negotiations had been opened by Mr. Saunders, our Minister at Madrid, for the purchase of Cuba. Our own government kept officially silent, but as soon as a detail came from the Spanish government, ours officially paraded that as a sufficient refutation of the story in the *Herald*.

But a Mr. Thomas Cautie Reynolds, who was Secretary of Legation at Madrid, and is moreover a Virginian, and as like to the great Don Nicholas P. Trist as one pea is like another, comes out with a long letter in the Charleston Courier, revealing almost all he knows of the matter, and he knows all about it, so far as so inflated, indirect, and *Twisful* a document can reveal anything. If we people of the North should generally read this document, it would give them a very exalted opinion of American diplomacy and Virginian diplomatism. Reynolds very nearly calls Saunders an imbecile fool, and he clearly establishes his own title to the same character, so far as his knavery allows room for it.

It seems that in May, 1847, Mr. Saunders left Madrid, giving charge of the legation to the Secretary, Mr. Reynolds. The latter, supposing that the British had a design to get Cuba, either by exchanging Gibraltar for it, or taking a mortgage on it to secure their debt of some \$350,000,000, (as he estimates it,) watched the operations of the British bondholders, and says he "took means simple but efficacious to protect the interests of the United States in that event." He immediately apprized Mr. Saunders of what he had done, and got the following very delicate and slaveholder-like letter in reply, dated Havre, July 19th, 1847:

"I have just received your note of the 7th. I am glad you made the inquiry as to the English debt. Should there be any danger, sooner than the English should get any lien on Cuba, I would stipulate for the United States to guarantee the same way the payment of the debt, on having a mortgage on Cuba. "If you should ascertain that there is any foundation for your suggestion in regard to Cuba, you will at once call on the Minister of State, and request a suspension of the arrangement, until I can return, as I would at once come back if any plan of the kind was in agitation."

"Mr. Polk had instructed his minister to go as deep as to pay the whole Spanish debt to the British bondholders, he would probably impart such a secret to as few breasts as possible, and it seems that he must have been rather chary of it, at least in the opinion of his minister Saunders, for on the 24th of July, the minister wrote another letter from Havre to the Secretary of Legation, which the latter now publishes, showing that even Mr. Secretary Buchanan was not in full confidence of the slaveholders in regard to this delicate negotiation. This letter is as follows:

"What will Salamanca think of the threat contained in the letter of the committee of the bondholders to Latorre? Is it possible he had so little spirit as to receive such a document? As this matter is likely to be pressed on the Spanish government, I would write Mr. B. on the subject, but I shall reserve to myself the liberty of acting on the general instructions—assuming the responsibility of doing what the occasion may call for. I may therefore submit a proposition to the Minister."

In explanation of the mystery developed in this letter, Mr. Reynolds gives into a recital of the cases in which Mr. Polk had said one thing to his ministers and another to his Secretary of State, and makes a pretty consummate old fox of him. However, as Mr. Saunders had said he would not write to Buchanan, Reynolds thought that he would. So he wrote a volunteering despatch in which he ventured to express the opinion that Spain feared our attempts on Cuba more than she did British, &c., &c. And this was not enough; he magnifies himself very drolly by saying—

"To put an end to a question from which I apprehended much embarrassment to myself as well as danger to the interests of the United States, in case Mr. Saunders should prosecute his wild scheme of pledging our national faith for the payment of three hundred and fifty millions of dollars in order to obtain a mere mortgage on Cuba, I communicated, unofficially, to an elevated employee of the Spanish government, the detailed information my despatch contained, in reference to the parties then urging their claims as bondholders. He expressed his acknowledgements for that unassuming of a shameless stock-jobbing scheme, and concurred with me in the conviction that the course I suggested, and which has since been partially followed, would place the Spanish government in a position to check any unwarrantable importunities on the subject."

After all, however, Saunders did write to Buchanan, asking what was best to be done. And Reynolds made a parade, for what purpose we can not understand, of having written other important despatches which he afterwards destroyed.

This very important Secretary of Legation also magnifies himself for the part he was going to take—not officially—to defeat the divorce of the Queen of Spain, a measure which Sir Henry Bulwer was supposed to be urging. What under heaven an American Legation has to do with the divorce or marriage of Queens, we do not know, but this fellow, Reynolds, seems to have considered it his duty, by hook or by crook, officially or unofficially, to defeat the schemes of the British minister, and was only prevented from doing something important in that direction by the firmness of the Spanish prime minister, which, with admirable pomposity, he says—

"Defeated the powerful combination formed to gratify the supposed wishes of the Catholic Queen, and I was relieved from the necessity of taking the active and decided, but unofficial steps which in the conferences between the French Minister (M. de Gluckberg) and myself, I had been agreed upon that I should take, in case the efforts of Sir Henry Bulwer rendered it absolutely necessary to approach influences wielding great power over the mind of the sovereign herself."

Well, when a great nation employs a fool for an ambassador, of course it must put up with such revelations. In all this folly, however, he says he did not exceed his powers nor "disregard the stringent and even jealous instructions sent by Saunders." One plea of necessity, in which he participated, among these proceedings, he is going to keep secret! Hear him.

"In respect to one of those proceedings—relative to a supposed treasonable correspondence concerning the establishment of a free negro republic in Cuba—I am disposed to be silent, because the Spanish government has determined (I think wisely,) to preserve the most profound secrecy in regard to it."

O, Mr. Thomas Cautie Reynolds, what a pity! Do tell us about that "negro republic," do, do.

Mr. Reynolds lets out that in regard to Mr. Forsyth's instructions in relation to Cuba, he felt bound to keep them concealed, till Mr. Cass unfortunately revealed them, in his speech on the Yucatan question. It seems that the slaveholders have meant to keep the whole matter concealed from the first, but the Northern allies have been leaky. We gather from the verbiage of the mighty Mr. Reynolds that he was much displeased, not only with the conduct of Mr. Saunders, but of Mr. Polk and Mr. Cass, that he plotted to mystify Mr. Buchanan, and intended to manage the delicate matter much better for the slaveholders than any of them could have done, and more to the satisfaction of the whole country. He even tells us that Mr. Cass had been elected he intended to have impeached Mr. Polk for transgressing his constitutional power in the matter. This is rich. Hear him again:

"Had Mr. Cass been elected, I should, though I am and always have been a decided member of the political party which chiefly supported him, have felt constrained to take the advice of some eminent counsel, learned in the law, concerning the proper legal mode (if any there be for a simple citizen of the United States) of bringing to the cognizance of the House of Representatives an Executive proceeding, which I humbly conceive to be not only beyond the constitutional power of the President or his agents, but violative of the constitutional rights of every citizen of the Union, contrary to good faith, derogatory to the dignity and eminently detrimental to the interests of our common country."

But as Old Zuck, and not the ex-Cass was elected, all this was rendered unnecessary, and Mr. Reynolds, through Mr. Bots, thrust himself into the arms of General Taylor; about as rich a hoop to his administration—as say Rev. C. W. Denison.

Reynolds, after his dismissal from the legation, which took place in July, 1848, at the request of Saunders, and before the latter had entered upon his unsuccessful negotiation for the purchase of Cuba, it seems hung about the legation to get knowledge for use at home. And according to his own account he was pretty successful, though he came off long before the date of that remarkable letter in the *Herald*, the correctness of which he fully vouches for, and which we have no doubt originated in him.

The sublimely ignorant and stupidly ignorant of the ambassador Saunders, glorifies himself for the important aid which he rendered to the legation and this particular negotiation, even after his dismissal. But the passage is too rich to withhold from our readers, and we give it at some length:

"Mr. Saunders wrote to me from La Gravia for information of a most extended nature on several matters, which the knowledge I had already had of the nature of his instructions enabled me clearly to see was to be used in a negotiation for the purchase of Cuba. My official connection with the Legation had ceased entirely; the Secretary of State had carried his caution so far as to remove the precise moment when that connection should be dissolved; I had been recalled at the request of Mr. Saunders himself, so strenuously, though secretly urged, as to place the late President, in what his Secretary of State was pleased to term the "painful necessity" of granting it; yet I promptly furnished him (Mr. Saunders) with all the information within my reach, (except a portion, which I should have been bound to give, if an officer of the United States government, but which, as I was not, I was, so-called, bound to withhold,) and received, in return, his thanks for the data sent him."

But while I had too much respect for the authority of the government and for our laws, to attempt any interference with the acts of its officers abroad, I had the fixed determination, as far as in me lay, to prevent any attempt to carry out such a scheme without a due and proper consultation, not merely of party cliques or political managers at Washington, but of the American people, in the widest sense of the term.

I was also apprehensive that the question would be sprung upon the Democratic party, to which I belonged, and an attempt made to run Mr. Cass in upon that issue.—Considering that the question was one that should be kept apart from party issues, I viewed such a contingency with some alarm. I also felt bound as a Southern man, and indeed as an American, to look to the proposed annexation of Cuba; for, in that event, by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of the *Amistad*, about one half of the slaves of Cuba would be freed, and as the laws of that island make no distinction between free whites and free blacks, the South and the Union might find in their bosoms a free negro commonwealth, claiming the right to send freed slaves as Senators to our Congress unless proper provisions were made in, or previous to the conclusion of the treaty, to secure the present *de facto* position of the white population of Cuba."

In such a predicament it is no wonder the profound Secretary of Legation should fear Cassian, and prefer to transfer himself over to the rising Taylor dynasty, as he did by unbecomingly himself to Bots.

The result of the whole negotiation Mr. Reynolds thus richly sums up:

"The question of annexation has been, for the present at least, set at rest, as far as negotiation is concerned, by the truly remarkable course of the late administration and the U. S. Legation at Madrid. That course the public may possibly suspect to be a succession of adroit manoeuvres; it may dream of skillful management, of palace intrigues, of consultations with important representatives of Cuban wealth, or Cuban interests, disclosures over a general glass of

wine, earnest conversations to bring over, or light jests to sound some grave diplomat or minister of State, and all the other dazzling accompaniments of a ray diplomatic contest. Let it be undecided; the history of the formidable instructions sent to Mr. Saunders, is as short as instructive. A formal conference was solicited, to sound the disposition of General Navaez.

"Our Envoy's English was diluted into French for the edification of that fiery soldier; in return, his energetic thoughts, torn out of their Castilian idiom, were crammed up in a French dress, were again done into English for the convenience of Mr. Saunders. This linguistic entertainment soon grew irksome to the impatient Spaniard, and the conference was speedily but courteously terminated.—That ended this celebrated negotiation.—Whether it could have been made to result differently, had the usual weapons of diplomacy been employed, is a question into which I do not pretend to enter."

COMMUNICATED.

Is It Christianity?

DEAR BROTHERS:—There is little else that occasions me more pain than to be obliged to take exceptions to, or call in question, the propriety or correctness of the religious course of others; yet, as we value consistency, as we would defend Christianity as taught by the Divine Author, we often find ourselves necessitated to take exceptions to much that seeks to be endorsed by community as the religion of Jesus.

Our Methodist friends have been putting forth a "special effort" in this place for the last few days, with reference to the end of promoting a "revival," and I must be excused if I take the liberty to suggest a few considerations which make it a question in my mind, whether the more of good or of evil is the result of efforts of this character. Who, that is a careful observer of the form of proceeding with the older sects on occasions of the kind we refer to, can fail to see that the sum of the effort, the legitimate tendency of the whole course of proceeding is to beget in the minds of the people, and especially those coming more immediately under the influence of the effort, the idea that the claims of Christianity will have been met by them if they yield a hearty assent to certain dogmas, connect themselves with some religious sect, and observe the usages of that sect. Not a single human duty is ever presented—so far from it indeed, if any happen to have an idea of Christianity beyond simple faith and exercises, and take the liberty to suggest it, why, it is out of place, that's all.

To be a little more particular. There are a few around here who take the liberty to believe that God is no respecter of persons, and that consistent action growing out of that faith would be to regard no place or occasion too sacred to labor and pray for one-sixth of our fellow-citizens, who are by law forbidden to know anything truly of God, or "the Lord that bought them." That in seeking to induce people to repent of their sins, and lead new lives, this, their most heinous sin, should be presented, with the absolute necessity, as they would have God's pleasure, of taking a position where they would be clear in this matter. Well, as we had opportunity, we made these suggestions, to our friends, but not one could be induced to think it would be in place to say any thing in regard to the slave. One good anti-slavery sister, however, was a bit of a thorn in the flesh to them. She took the liberty in conference meeting one day to call the attention of the meeting to their duty to the slave.—The effect was a silence as of death for a short time, when the minister requested that they speak on, but "speak to the point."—Yes, to refer to the *chained* is always foreign from the point with a Methodist priest! I have been told that occasionally during the meeting he fell into the hands of those who would call his attention to the case of the slave, but the sum of his response was, "I cannot lay off the mantle of divinity to preach abolition!" Yet, strange to say, he claims to be anti-slavery! Well, now who does not see that the result of religious sentiments imbibed under circumstances like these, is, to beget the impression that, if we owe a duty to the slave, which is doubtful, it is of such a character as to have no connection with our religion, but must be attended to when we have the least religious feeling;—and so, as in the case of a special outpouring, when we would have most of the love of God in our hearts, we must have the greatest possible unconcern for his creatures! This is just the effect of such a course, and no honest man will deny it. The ministers will not open their mouths for the dumb, and just in proportion as they have influence in community, do they shut up the ears of the people to those who would speak out on this absorbing subject. Is it, then, Christianity?

LET THE SLAVE ANSWER.
But I am not through with this meeting. As usual, the bug-bear of "INFIDEL" was sounded to the people. At an early stage of the meeting I sent a respectful invitation to the ministers to call on me. But no! poor cowards, so far from it, if they wished to see the friend who works in the shop with me, they would call at his house and send a child for him. One of them gave, as a reason why he should not call on me, that he "had no affinity for my atmosphere." I addressed to him the following note:

REV. JOHN MCCLAIN—SIR:—I believe the Methodist Episcopal Church anti-Christian, and essentially sinful. 1st. Because it is a

slaveholding and slavery-sustaining Church. 2d. Because it is a war-approving and war-sustaining Church. I believe in the Christian religion, and "have a desire to flee the wrath to come." Will you receive my name as a probationer in said church, giving me the right, as in duty bound, to show the church their sin in these particulars!

With due respect,
E. F. CURTIS.

March 19th, 1849.
P. S. If you are so far wanting in "affinity for my atmosphere" as to render a personal interview in any manner dangerous to you, please answer this by note.

To this proposition I received no response. The insignificance of the source from whence it emanated cannot be pleaded, as the continued use of the stale old word "infidel," with sundry like slanderous epithets, bear faithful evidence. Why, then, did my proposition not receive a favorable answer? I firmly believe it is because they are satisfied of the truth of my charges, and they do not care that the members should know the evidence of their truth! If they believe them to exist only in imagination, would they hesitate? How easy to remove the imaginary evidence; satisfying the people of the purity of the Church, and, saving a soul from "infidelity," would cover a multitude of "opposing influences."

Till the end.
E. F. CURTIS.
Orangeville, March 25, 1849.

FRIENDS EDITORS:

I hold it strictly true, that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." And holding this true, I believe it to be the duty of all philanthropists to expose whatever is prejudicial to liberty, no matter by whom the wrong is done. If the cause of human freedom suffers by the hand of an individual in high station, or in a situation where he has extensive influence over others, then is there much greater need of rebuke, for the reason, that in proportion to the influence he possesses will be the injury produced.

Acting upon this principle, I wish to notice two or three specimens of our opponents in this vicinity. And first, I would remark by way of preface, that perhaps it is not generally known to the readers of the Bugle, that there has been a glorious revival of anti-slavery sentiment in a portion of Rowstown, in this County. This revival commenced about fifteen months since, and was what sectarians would call a "protracted effort." During its progress, several members of the Methodist Episcopal Church were pricked to the heart, and hopefully converted to the truly wholesome doctrine of "No union with slaveholders." Of course such a movement, by members of the church, could not escape the watchful eye of the "preacher in charge," and consequently the thunder of Methodist Episcopal artillery was soon heard on all sides against the movement. In short, the utmost effort was put forth to crush this anti-slavery feeling, individuals were visited privately, and every method resorted to, which priestly ingenuity and cunning could devise, to win them from the truth—but all to no purpose. At last most of them left the church. Among those who did not withdraw, was Mr. C.—A few weeks since, this Mr. C. was called upon by the Rev. Carlos Chapman, a Methodist minister on the Edinburgh Circuit, of which Circuit, Rowstown forms a part. Mr. Chapman demanded of Mr. C., the reason why he did not attend the meetings of the Church. Mr. C. alluded to the pro-slavery position of the Church as one reason, and among other things, he said that the government of the M. E. Church was tyrannical, anti-republican, &c. Thereupon Mr. Chapman cautioned him against using such language, or he would be "dealt with!" In other words, that the recusant would be summoned to appear before the august inquisition of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for opinion's sake! The result of Mr. Chapman's visit was not as favorable as he could have wished, and ended with a declaration, on the part of the enlightened member, that he was yet a free moral agent, and needed no leading string. For during this to speak out, and express his opinions, he will probably be "dealt with," What a pity it is that he could not relish the hooks of Methodism instead of more secular food!

Thus we see that the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in Rowstown are not allowed to think for themselves; or if, for the sake of being a little indulgent, Mr. Chapman allows them to think, they must not give expression to their thoughts. I presume this excited Rev. wishes to do all the thinking himself, the dear soul! The truth is, the members of the M. E. Church, are reduced to a state of vassalage,—and this is why they are so completely under the dictation of the priesthood. They are slaves themselves, and their ministers are the drivers. Until they throw off their shackles, we can hope for no aid from them in the great work of rescuing our countrymen from bondage.

But I have digressed, and forgotten my text.—I am credibly informed that Carlos Chapman voted for that renowned man-thief, Zachary Taylor. This is in harmony with his course—for a man that supports an oppressor, is induced to oppress those beneath him. The Rev. John Bain, the "wolf" who has charge of the Methodist "flock" in this place, also voted for "Old Zack." This same John Bain, at a meeting of the Portage

County Bible Society, held in Windham Township, on the 7th of February last, addressed that body from the words, "Love one another!"—a very good text, and one which it becomes all Taylor men to ponder upon.

The Township of Edinburgh, in this County, is well supplied with pro-slavery filth, in the shape of superannuated Methodist preachers—which is interpreted to mean those worn out in the service of the Church. Alas, for the cause of humanity, they are as active as ever in the cause of Satan, their lord and master. They lose no opportunity to do violence to the cause of freedom, and if an anti-slavery meeting is proposed to be held in the township, the highest ambition of these worthies is to render it a failure.

I presume that Methodism in this vicinity is a fair index to Methodism everywhere in the United States. And thus we behold a great work before us, in ridding these sections of the letters which prevent their co-operation with us. Friends, let us address ourselves to the task with more zeal and energy than ever, and we shall ultimately reap a glorious harvest.

Yours, always,
SPECTATOR.

RAVENNA, April 6th, 1849.
ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.
SALEM, APRIL 13, 1849.

"I LOVE ANIMATION WHEN THERE IS CAUSE FOR IT—THE ALARM BELL WHICH STARTLES THE INHABITANTS OF A CITY, SAVES THEM FROM BEING BURNED IN THEIR BEDS. Edmund Burke.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chestnut sts.

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE American Anti-Slavery Society.

THE FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held in the Tabernacle, Broadway, New-York, on Tuesday, the 8th day of May next.

The Annual Meeting of the American Society is the most important anti-slavery meeting held any where during the year. The Anniversary at the Tabernacle represents to the country at large the progress, the efficiency, and even the existence, of the Anti-Slavery cause. It is to vast numbers of people, the only sign of the continued zeal and spirit of the Abolitionists, whose local meetings they never hear of.

The Business Meetings of the Society have always brought together in counsel a large number of Abolitionists from various parts of the Northern States than is ever convened on any other occasion. The general interests of the cause command, at that time, a consideration which at no other can be given them.

It has never, since the formation of the Society, been more apparent than at this moment, that the Anti-Slavery cause is left where it has been, in the hands of the members of the American Society. There is as yet no reason to suppose that Slavery will ever be abolished, except through its efforts.

The general importance of the annual meeting, and the aspect of the cause at this moment, which gives us every thing to hope for, we persevere—every thing to fear if we falter—appeal alike loudly to Abolitionists, all over the land, to make the ensuing Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society one that shall do more even than any previous one has done to drive the South to despair in defence of its felonious system of society, and the North to a more determined attitude, than any portion of it has ever yet ventured to assume in defence of its own rights, and the assertion of the rights of the slave.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.
WENDELL PHILLIPS, } Secretaries.
S. H. GAY, }

The Society of Friends—its early Anti-Slavery Action.

In a former article we confined our notice to the action of Friends in England from their organization down to the abolition of the African slave-trade. The course pursued by Friends in America was similar to that adopted by their trans-atlantic brethren. There was, however a difference in their situation; the former lived in a country where slavery existed, and where the horrors and enormities of the system were continually before them; and although this would enable them to act with greater efficiency, they had greater difficulties to contend with. The public sentiment in favor of slavery was stronger than that which prevailed in England. The laws were unfavorable to emancipation, and in the southern parts of the country almost amounted to a total prohibition. Many of the members of the society were directly engaged in slaveholding, and strongly opposed to any action against the system. Yet so early as 1688, some German Friends who had settled in Pennsylvania, introduced the subject into the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, urging upon its members the inconsistency of slavery with the principles of Christianity. These were they to whom the Quaker poet, Whit-
ter, referred, when he wrote of

"That brother-band,
The sorrowing exiles from their "Father land,"
Leaving their bones in Krieshien's bowers of vine,
And the blue beauty of their glorious Rhine,
To seek amid our solemn depths of wood
Freedom from man, and holy peace with God;
Who first of all their testimonial gave
Against the oppressor,—for the outcast slave."

It was not, however, until 1754—so slow was the growth of anti-slavery principles—

that the meeting was prepared to act officially, and to issue, even a qualified protest, against slavery and the slave-trade. In that year they published an address, exhorting their members to refrain from the purchase or importation of slaves; and when they did possess them, they were desired to

"Make it your constant care to watch over them for good, instructing them in the fear of God, and the knowledge of the gospel of Christ, that they may answer the end of their creation, and that God may be glorified and honored by them as well as by us; and so train them up, that if you should come to behold their unhappy situation, in the same light that many worthy men, who are at rest, have done, and many of your brethren now do, and should think it your duty to set them free, that they may be more capable of making use of their liberty. How can we be said to love our brethren, who bring, or for selfish ends, keep them in bondage? Do we act consistently with this noble principle who lay such heavy burdens on our fellow creatures. Do we consider that they are called, and do we sincerely desire they may become heirs with us in glory, and that they may rejoice in the liberty of the sons of God, whilst we are withholding from them the common liberties of mankind? Or can the spirit of God, by which we have always professed to be led, be the author of these oppressive and unrighteous measures? Or do we not thereby manifest that temporal interest both more influence on our conduct herein, than the dictates of that merciful, holy, and unerring Guide?"

In 1775, twenty one years after the issuing of their first address upon the subject, they adopted a rule of Discipline, forbidding their members to engage in the buying or importation of slaves; and in 1776, required that all who were slaveholders should manumit their slaves or be disowned from membership. The Yearly Meetings of New-England, New-York, Maryland, Carolina and Georgia in the course of time followed the example thus set them, and the society became purged of slaveholding members. The position thus assumed by Friends was greatly in advance of the age; and their testimony against the buying and selling of their fellow men, shone all the brighter because of the more than midnight darkness which prevailed—it was a testimony, which, as much as any other, marked the Friends of former days, as "a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

In America, as in England, members of the society were to be found, whose sphere of labor was not confined within the bounds of the religious organization with which they were connected, who were not content with its official action, but felt their individual responsibilities, and the need of individual labor whenever and wherever they deemed it would be useful. Among the first to engage in the work was William Burling of Long Island, and Ralph Sandford of Philadelphia. The latter wrote a work against slavery in 1729, and though threatened by the Chief Judge of Pennsylvania if he should publish it, he was not to be deterred from the performance of his duty, but printed and circulated it free of expense.

Soon after this, the eccentric Benjamin Lay removed from Barbadoes to Pennsylvania, and greatly aided to keep alive the anti-slavery agitation which was then beginning to prevail among Friends. His plainness of speech, his energy of character and his constant testimony against the sinfulness of slaveholding awakened many, who, under a less energetic and peculiar preacher, would have remained in a state of indifference.—His manner and his speech was truly peculiar, as will be inferred from the following facts. Lay used to be a constant attendant at Monthly Meeting, and whenever any slaveholding member attempted to speak, he would cry out "There's another negro master!" This was a "plainness of speech" which many regarded as uncalled for by the Discipline, and was extremely distasteful to the members generally. One of his neighbors held a negro girl as a slave, and Lay, who had labored with them unsuccessfully for her redemption, at length adopted an effectual means to make them feel the wrongs they were inflicting. He met their son, a lad of six years, and coaxed him to go home with him. The parents vainly sought their child, and toward night came to Lay, exclaiming in agony "Oh, Benjamin! Our child has been missing all day." He replied, "Your child is safe in my house, and you may now conceive of the sorrow you inflict upon the parents of the negro girl you hold in slavery; for she was torn from them by avarice."

John Woolman, of New York, was another unwearied advocate of the slave's cause; and the principles he espoused in youth, he faithfully maintained till death. Though mild and gentle in language and in spirit, no one could stand firmer for the truth than did he. His ministrations were unlike those of Benjamin Lay; but as Luther and Melancthon were both needed in the protestant reformation, so was the ardent soul of Lay, and the gentle spirit of Woolman both necessary agents in accomplishing the work to which they gave themselves. Woolman was a preacher in the society, and traveled extensively, not only in America, but in England; and wherever he went, in the South as in the North, on this as on the other side of the Atlantic, he ceased not to remember, and to plead for the deliverance of the bondman.—