

FREDERICK DOUGLASS' PAPER IS PUBLISHED AT 25 BUFFALO STREET (OPPOSITE THE ARCHES) BY FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

TERMS: Single copy, one year \$2.00; Three copies, one year 5.00; Five copies, one year 8.00; Ten copies, one year 15.00; Single copy, six months 1.00; Ten copies, six months 5.00; Voluntary Agents are entitled to retain 50 cents commission on each new yearly subscriber, except in the case of clubs.

In making up clubs for FREDERICK DOUGLASS' PAPER, it is not requisite that the subscribers shall all be of the Post Office.

ADVERTISEMENTS: Not exceeding ten lines, inserted three times for ONE DOLLAR, every subsequent insertion, TWENTY-FIVE CENTS. Liberal reductions made on yearly advertisements.

All communications, whether on business, or for publication, should be addressed to FREDERICK DOUGLASS, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

WILLIAM OLIVER, PRINTER.

Selections.

Slavery.

[The spirit of slavery will have little rest in Ireland, while there lives in that country a gentleman so vigilant and so well informed as the philanthropic writer of the following letter to the Cork Examiner:—Ed. F. D.'s Paper.]

To the Editor of the Cork Examiner:—Sir—A friend in Cork having furnished me with a copy of a letter on "Slavery," by the Rev. Alexander J. Peyton, P. P., Barney, which has appeared in your widely read journal, I beg you will kindly allow me the privilege of a short reply to it in your columns.

The Rev. gentleman, in deference to the honest public opinion of Ireland, has found himself under the necessity of saying what otherwise would never be discovered in the long letter he has written to portray the happy condition of his brethren who are held as merchandise in America, "I am no advocate for slavery," and further, "With this favorable report there are circumstances connected with slavery which show forth the evil tendencies of the system and are calculated to excite the compassion of the virtuous and intelligent."

Now, I ask every virtuous and intelligent reader of Mr. Peyton's letter, if they ever read of, or imagined in their own minds, a more perfect state of earthly happiness for working men than he describes to be the actual condition of the three and a half millions of his fellow creatures who are held in bondage by their kind caretakers! In the United States of America—I was about to say forcibly held in bondage, but that, from the statement of the Rev. gentleman, we are led to believe that his bondage is a willing condition, a condition of peace and happiness as is not to be found in any other land under Heaven, and they love it so well as to have no desire, nay, that they actually refuse to accept the generous gift of being their own caretakers, and the caretakers of their wives and children.

Mr. Peyton occasionally conveys the idea, that the marriage relation is held sacred by the holders of slaves, and that want of chastity on the part of female slaves is held to be peculiarly disgraceful. I hope the Rev. gentleman is really ignorant of the true state of the case in relation to these matters, but which are so notoriously the reverse of the view he has given of them, that it needs a great stretch of charity to believe he was not drawn on his imagination for the pleasing picture of virtue he has delineated. What, sir, is a notorious truth, that the slave has no legal protection in these respects. The marriage tie is continually and ruthlessly torn asunder, and fresh connections are forced on the parties with as little compunction as if they were brutes, and not immortal beings.

Has the Rev. gentleman never heard of the breeding states of the union? If he has not, he is a very incompetent witness for the wicked system he has undertaken to defend. I cannot go over every paragraph of his letter, and expose the false conclusions he would lead his readers into. To do so would be a task of difficulty, but it would require a very respectful notice to his letter, and I am not disposed to do so. There is, however, one great suppression, or unintentional omission, touching a matter of fact, which I must refer to, as it is fatal to the entire structure of philanthropy and benevolence which he has built up for these most just and kind-hearted gentry, the slaveholders of America.

Mr. Peyton would lead his readers to believe that the slave is protected by law from the exercise of excessive cruelty on the part of his master. It is true that there are enactments in some, perhaps in all of the slave states, guaranteeing certain rights to the slave, in relation to punishment, food, clothing, &c., but does not Mr. P. well know that the laws are not only not enforced, but are hypocritically intended to do nothing of the kind, are all rendered of no effect by an infernal devised clause, which is, that no colored man can give evidence against a white man. Could anything more diabolical than this rule be devised? Even Mr. Peyton's case in illustration of his views of the master's justice and magnanimity in the proof of his selfishness and his cruelty. For the atrocious murder of four slaves a pecuniary fine is said to have been levied; and we are not told that any means were resorted to to ensure the payment of the fine.

Indeed, in the absence of names and dates, or place, Mr. Peyton must excuse my doubting, or denying altogether, the land of the story which has been foisted on him, and which, even if true, is a disgrace instead of an honor to the community in which the occurrences took place. I beg leave to refer the Rev. Gentleman and your readers to "The Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin" for ample evidence of the fallacy that any rights whatever are secured to the slave in that land where the written Constitution so proudly proclaims, but the practice of whose people wickedly denies, "that all men are created alike free and equal, and equally entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Edw. Kuffin, who is represented to be one of the first lawyers in America, and who is described as not only an enlightened, but a humane man, on an occasion of a solemn legal decision, declares "The power of the matter must be absolute to render the submission of the slave perfect."

In conclusion, I express my regret that an educated Irish gentleman and a clergyman, should have volunteered to write such a letter as Mr. Peyton has done, in almost open defiance of an unwholesome system, which even Jefferson—a slaveholder himself—trembled to contemplate, and has left on record those memorable words in relation to slavery, "I tremble for my country, when I remember that God is just, and that he has no attribute which can take part with us."

It is sad to know that Irishmen in America are too apt to take sides with the oppressor. They fly away from what they consider political persecution, and social wrongs, in their hands, and in the hands of the stranger, they throw themselves into the arms of the man-stealer, and the woman-whipper, and the cradle plunderer, and the Rev. A. Peyton, P. P., Barney, joins in the cry.

Would to God that my countrymen were not only the professed, but the honest and true friends of liberty—liberty for all of every color and of every clime.

I am, sir, respectfully yours, JAMES HAUGHTON.

Women's State Temperance Society.

FIRST DAY.

At ten o'clock yesterday, the Society was called to order by Mrs. E. C. STANTON, who said if any one present desired to offer vocal prayer, an opportunity was offered. Prayer was then offered by a young man in one of the side aisles. The platform was occupied by Mrs. STANTON, MISS EMILY CLARK, Miss LUCY STONE, Mrs. VAUGHN, Miss Dr. HUNT, Mrs. NICHOLS, Mrs. FISH, Mrs. ALBRO, Mrs. ALLING, and Mrs. LYDIA N. FOWLER.

The attendance at this opening session is much larger this year than last, and a more hopeful spirit prevails. There are several of the notabilities of the Woman's Right's cause seated around the table, and a fair sprinkling of Bloomers is scattered throughout the audience. There were many out, attracted by curiosity, though probably the most ardent friends of the Society. The proceedings were of a deeply interesting character, both from their novelty and their importance. After the prayer was concluded, Mrs. Stanton read her annual address, as follows:

MRS. STANTON'S ADDRESS.

A little more than one year ago, in this same hall, we formed the first Woman's State Temperance Society. We believed that it would come for women to speak out on this question, and we were not disappointed. We heard in the councils of the church and state. It was proposed at that time that we, instead of forming a society, should go en masse into the State Temperance Society. We were assured that in becoming members by paying the sum of \$1, we should thereby secure the right to speak and vote in their meetings.

We who had watched the jealousy with which man had eyed the slow aggressions of woman, warned you against the insidious proposition made by agents from this society. We told you they would not doubt receive the dollar, but that you would never be allowed to speak or vote in their meetings. Many of you thought us suspicious and unjust towards the temperance men of the Empire State. The fact that Abby Kelly had been permitted to speak in one of their public meetings, was brought up as an argument by some agent of that society, to prove our fears unfounded. We suggested that she spoke by favor and not right, and our right there as equals to speak and vote, as well knew would never be acknowledged. A long debate saved you from that false step, and our predictions have been fully realized in the treatment our delegates received at the annual meeting, held at Syracuse last July, and at the recent meeting in N. York.

In forming our society the mass of us being uneducated and liberal we had chosen no platform—we no more respecters of persons, all are alike welcome here without regard to sect, color or caste. There have been, however, many objections made to one feature in our constitution, and that is, that although we admit men as members with equal right to speak and vote in our meetings, we claim the office for women, and we felt in starting the necessity of throwing all responsibility on woman, which we know she never would take, and if there were any men at hand to think, act, and plan for her. The result has shown the wisdom of what seemed so objectionable to many.

It is, however, a temporary expedient, and as presents many true friends of the cause, and becoming members of our Society, and as the officers of our Society are now well skilled in the practical business of getting up meetings, raising funds, &c., and have fairly learned how to stand and walk alone,—it may perhaps be wise to raise men to an equal footing with women, in speaking, hearing, however, that he will modestly pay the dues, and continue the work they have so successfully begun. I would suggest, therefore, that after the business of the year be disposed of, this objectionable feature of our constitution be brought under consideration.

Our experience thus far as a society has been most encouraging. We have four agents who have travelled in various parts of the State, and I need not say what is well known to all present that their labors thus far have given entire satisfaction to the society, and the public. I was surprised and pleased to find that without the least preparation or experience, who had never raised their voices in public, one year ago, should with so much self-reliance, dignity and force enter at once such a field of labor, and so ably perform the work. In the metropolis of our country, in the capital of our State, in the halls of our Legislature, and in the country school-house, they have been alike successful and faithful to the truth. In behalf of our Society I thank you for your unwearied labors during the past year. In the name of humanity, I bid you go on and devote yourselves humbly to the cause you have espoused. The noble work of our sex everywhere, and in every age, is to be themselves a new impulse to struggle upward and onward, and the deep through silent gratitude that ascends to Heaven from the wretched outcast, the wives, the mothers, and the daughters of the brutal drunkards is well known to all who have listened to their tales of woe, their bitter experience, the dark sad passages of their tragic lives.

I hope this first year is prophetic of a happy future of strong, united and energetic action among the women of our State. If we are sincere and earnest in our love of this cause, in our devotion to truth, in our desire for the happiness of the race, we shall ever lose sight of self—each soul will, in the work of our treasury is a test, we have abundant reason to believe that in the hearts of the people we are approved, and by their purses we shall be sustained.

It has been objected to our society that we do not confine ourselves to the subject of temperance, but talk too much about woman's rights, divorce, and the church. It could be easily shown how the consideration of this great question is as legitimately introduced into the discussion of these various subjects. One class of minds would deal with effects alone; another would enquire into causes, the work of the former is easily perceived and quickly done; that of the latter requires deep thought, great patience, much time and a wise self-denial. Our reports to the present day are a good type of the mass of our reformers. They take out cancers, cut off tentacles, drive the poison which nature has wisely thrown to the surface back again, quiet uneasy nerves with valerian, and by means of steady infuse an artificial courage into a faint heart that he may bravely endure some painful operation. He repairs but he does not think to let the wise physician who shall trace out the true causes of suffering, who shall teach us the great immutable laws of life and health, who shall show us how and where in our every day life we are violating those laws, and the true point to begin the reform, is doing a much higher, broader, and deeper work than he who shall bend all his energies to the temporary relief of suffering. Those temperance men or women whose whole work consists in denouncing rum-sellers, appealing to legislatures, eulogizing Neal Dow, and shouting Maine Law, are superficial reformers, more surface workers. True this outside work has its uses, but let them lay no hindrance in the way of that class of mind, who seeing in our present false social relations, the causes of

the moral deformities of the race, would fain declare the immutable laws that govern mind as well as matter, and point out the true causes of the evils we see about us, whether lurking under the shadow of the altar, or the assumed superiority of man.

1st. We have been obliged to present woman's rights because many, instead of listening to what we had to say on temperance, have questioned the rights of a woman to speak on any subject. In all courts of justice if the rights of the speaker be to be questioned, all business waits until the mass of minds that may testify regarding this foothold, and much less a right to stand on an even pedestal with man, look him in the face as an equal, and rebuke the sins of her day and generation. Let it be clearly understood then that we are a woman's rights society, and that we believe it woman's duty to speak as well as for the strong man to do so; that it is her right to be heard in all the councils of church and State. The fact that our agents are women settles the question of our character on this point. Again, in discussing the question of temperance, all lecturers from the beginning have mentioned the drunkard's wife and children, of widows and orphans' tears—now shall these classes of sufferers be introduced but as themes for a rhetorical flourish; the pathetic touches of the speaker's eloquence; shall we passively shed tears over their condition, or by giving them their rights bravely to them the doors of escape from a wretched and degraded life?—Is it not legitimate in this to discuss the social degradation, the legal disabilities of the drunkard's wife? If in showing her wrongs, we prove the rights of all womankind to the elective franchise, to a fair representation in our legislatures—to the right in criminal cases to be tried by their own choosing, shall it be said that we transcend the bounds of our subject? If in pointing out her social degradation, we show you how the present laws outrage the sacredness of the marriage institution—if in proving to you that justice and mercy demand a legal separation from drunkenness we grasp the higher idea, that unity of soul alone constitutes and sanctifies true marriage, and that any law or public sentiment, that forces two high souls to live together as man and wife, unless held there by love, is false to God and humanity, who shall say that the discussion of this question does not lead us legitimately into the consideration of the important subject of divorce?

But why attack the church? We do not attack the church; we defend our rights merely against its attacks. It is true that the church and reformers have always been in an antagonistic position from the time of Luther down to our own day, and will continue to be until the devotional and practical views of christianity shall be united in one harmonious whole. To those who see the philosophy of this position there seems to be cause for fearful forebodings, or helpless regret. By the light of reason and truth, in good time, all these seeming differences shall pass away.

Patience and friction there must needs be in our present state, but let the earnest soul patiently and hopefully wait its time—with meekness meet the odium cast upon it—nobly still work on for the best of the race—and joyously live in the full assurance of the final triumph of the right and the true. I have no special fall to find with the church; to me human nature seems to manifest itself in very many ways in the church and out of it. Go through any community you please, penetrate into the nursery, the kitchen, the parlor, the places of merchandise, the market place and exchange, and who can tell the church member from the outsider? I see no reason why we should expect more of the church than of the world. Why, say you, they lay claim to greater holiness, to more rigid creeds, to a belief in a sterner God, to a closer observance of forms. The bible with them is a rule of life, the foundation of faith, and why should we not look to them for reforms of purity, goodness and truth above all other things? The assumption, therefore, on all sides called for themselves a higher position than the church. Our God is a God of justice, mercy, and truth. Their God sanctions violence, oppression and wine bibbing, and winks at gross, moral delinquencies. Our Bible commands us to love our enemies, to resist not evil, to break even, and to love them that oppress you free, and makes a noble life of more importance than a stern faith. Their Bible permits war, slavery, capital punishment, and makes salvation depend on faith and ordinances. In their creed it is a sin to dance, to pick up sticks on the sabbath day, to go to the theatre, to take large parties during Lent, to read a notice of any reformer, to lean from the altar, or permit a woman to speak in the church. In our creed it is a sin to hold a slave, to hang a man on the gallows, to make war on defenseless nations, or to sell rum to a weak brother, and rob the widow and the orphan of a protector and a home.

Thus may we see the difference of our creeds, but from the similarity in the product of the human family, it is fair to infer that our differences are more intellectual than spiritual, and all the great truths we bear so dearly uttered on all sides, have been incorporated as vital principles into the inner life of but few individuals.

We must not expect the Church to leap on a higher position. She sends forth her missionaries of truth one by one. All of our reformers have, in a measure, been developed in the world, and we have seen the growth of the advocates and opposers of the Reform of our day, have grown up side by side, partaking of the same ordinance, and officiating at the same altar, but one by applying more fully his christian principles to life, and pursuing an admitted truth to its legitimate results, has unwittingly found himself in antagonism with his brethren.

Belief is not voluntary, and change is the natural result of growth and development. We would have all reformers to be true to their principles of Temperance, but if the Church in her wisdom has made her platform so broad that wine bibbers and rum-sellers may repose in ease thereon, who are we to cry against the Church? It is our duty to complain. Having thus briefly noticed some of the objections to our movement, I will not detain the audience longer than this time.

The annual report of the Executive Committee was then read by Miss Vaughn. The society includes about 2 thousand members. The lecturing agents for the Society during the year have been Mrs. C. Vaughn, Emily Clark, Susan B. Anthony, H. A. Albro, and Miss Wright. The Lecturers have been eminently successful in their efforts, and are influencing for good. Thirty Conventions have been canvassed, and testimony is borne by the people and the press to the good accomplished. The Committee express pleasure in the success of the Society's Agents. Their efforts have been chiefly directed to the Maine Law.

Temperance papers and newspapers have been largely procured, and a subscriber list of the Society published 50,000 pages of tracts. They commend the importance of these little messengers to the attention of the Society. People will read these silent and unobtrusive teachings when they will not hear the living speaker.

The report then took up the subject of the drunkard's wife and her duties. The Executive Committee have offered a prize of \$10, for the first tract by a woman upon the relation of woman to the cause, and Mrs. Nichols has been requested to publish her views upon Divorce on the ground of intemperance. Temperance papers are then noticed, and the Liberator is chiefly commended, for its fearlessness and ability. Many of the Religious and Secular journals favor the Maine Law.

No new State Organization has been formed during the year. The Temperance Society, and the Caron League are alluded to and their efforts represented as earnest and

constant. The right of women to act in the Temperance cause is recognized. A petition largely signed by women was presented to the Legislature during the winter. The Report refers to the treatment received by the women at the hands of the State Society in Syracuse, and in New York, and the gentlemen who took so prominent a part in these proceedings were handled with severity, and the whole point was argued in the Report at great length.

The Society has held one meeting during the year and one Mass Convention. The first at Seneca Falls was largely attended, and a petition was prepared by them for signatures by the women, for the Maine Law. The mass meeting was held in Albany in January, and was very fully attended. A Committee of this Convention presented a petition to the Legislature signed by 28,000 women. The Maine Law was the watch-word of the Convention.

Every city in the State has been visited by our lecturers. In New York city the strong hold of the liquor traffic, an earnest effort has been made. The Report traced the progress of Maine Law legislation and stated its present position and popularity where it has been adopted. In Michigan, it is probable, the law will be adopted at a popular election during the next session.

The condition of Legislation on this subject is regarded as highly promising, and most sanguine hopes are indulged. In this State, the hope of a Maine Law is deferred another year, unless it is passed by the Extra Session. Most votes, and leave petitioning to women. The true method of carrying out this reform is through the ballot box. The reading of the report being concluded, on motion it was accepted.

A brief discussion arose upon an important point, as to the time when Miss Stanton went into the field. The President pompously said that by saying it made no difference who went first or last, all had done well. On a motion to adopt, the report was thrown open to discussion.

Mr. Bloomer, of Seneca Falls, said that he thought a prominent fall of all reports, was to represent matters in too favorable a light. He believed that there was more liquor drunk in this State now than at any time during the past five years. He regarded the Maine Law as less hopeful now in the legislature than at the last session.

Miss Lucy Stone, said if indeed it was true that there was more liquor drunk now than heretofore, it is not also true that there are more earnest workers in the field, and more efficient organizations now than heretofore? The success of the cause depends more upon the force opposed to the liquor influence, than its defeat depends upon the increased consumption of liquor.

Mr. H. A. Albro, coincided with Mr. Bloomer. His experience might lead him to the liquor influence was never stronger than now. The power opposed to the moral force in favor of temperance is very great. I hope at this Convention we may gain a moral power, in that shall carry us on during the coming year, in our assaults upon the Rum interest.

Mr. Nichols, of Seneca Falls, said that he had been thus far to separate the sheep from the goats—the temperance men from their opponents. This labor has been very successful. I cannot but think that the cause is retrograding. I know that God is working with us. Man had carried the cause as far up the hill as he could. It was the part of humanity that gathers into our churches, to see human nature seems to manifest itself in very many ways in the church and out of it. Go through any community you please, penetrate into the nursery, the kitchen, the parlor, the places of merchandise, the market place and exchange, and who can tell the church member from the outsider? I see no reason why we should expect more of the church than of the world. Why, say you, they lay claim to greater holiness, to more rigid creeds, to a belief in a sterner God, to a closer observance of forms. The bible with them is a rule of life, the foundation of faith, and why should we not look to them for reforms of purity, goodness and truth above all other things? The assumption, therefore, on all sides called for themselves a higher position than the church. Our God is a God of justice, mercy, and truth. Their God sanctions violence, oppression and wine bibbing, and winks at gross, moral delinquencies. Our Bible commands us to love our enemies, to resist not evil, to break even, and to love them that oppress you free, and makes a noble life of more importance than a stern faith. Their Bible permits war, slavery, capital punishment, and makes salvation depend on faith and ordinances. In their creed it is a sin to dance, to pick up sticks on the sabbath day, to go to the theatre, to take large parties during Lent, to read a notice of any reformer, to lean from the altar, or permit a woman to speak in the church. In our creed it is a sin to hold a slave, to hang a man on the gallows, to make war on defenseless nations, or to sell rum to a weak brother, and rob the widow and the orphan of a protector and a home.

Thus may we see the difference of our creeds, but from the similarity in the product of the human family, it is fair to infer that our differences are more intellectual than spiritual, and all the great truths we bear so dearly uttered on all sides, have been incorporated as vital principles into the inner life of but few individuals.

We must not expect the Church to leap on a higher position. She sends forth her missionaries of truth one by one. All of our reformers have, in a measure, been developed in the world, and we have seen the growth of the advocates and opposers of the Reform of our day, have grown up side by side, partaking of the same ordinance, and officiating at the same altar, but one by applying more fully his christian principles to life, and pursuing an admitted truth to its legitimate results, has unwittingly found himself in antagonism with his brethren.

Whereas, Women equally with men, are endowed by their Creator with an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and whereas, men, equally with women, are entitled to all the essential rights of civil government, to be just and guided by a government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; and whereas, by amendment I of the constitution of the United States, the people are forever and every where guaranteed the right of peaceably assembling to petition government for the redress of grievances; and whereas, women, of the whole people, the chief sufferers from grievances caused by intemperance; therefore Resolved, That we ever and wherever the enactment of prohibitory laws in intoxicating drinks is submitted to the suffrages of the people, it is the duty and right of women to meet in public assembly, to petition, to present their views in favor of such legislation and governmental action, as will best protect their sisters, brothers, husbands, sons and fathers from the intolerable grievances of drunkenness.

Mrs. Nichols said the propriety of woman's voting is a mooted question. We are told that men represent us, and that is all we ask. It is apparent that if the drunkard's wife is represented, it is to the Poor house; if his children are represented, it is to poverty, crime and death. Men are not to be trusted for us and that best, is so miserable a time to inquire if something else can not be done. The fear is we shall be unsexed, and shall lose our delicacy. It is a serious thing, and I would not have woman lose anything that would destroy her influence on the side of purity. We hear that outrages are committed at the polls, but how do we know it. We have never had an opportunity to learn. I have spoken at the town House. I was treated with perfect respect. Men and women meet freely in the streets, in the House of God, in the public conveyance, and women are differently treated.

My vote is cast for it to alone. It has not been good for woman. For it is when man has been alone, that he has committed these outrages upon woman, and passed these laws that bear so severely upon her. If it indicates for woman to go to the ballot boxes and vote in the midst of drunkards, it is not indicative for woman to be the wives and mothers of drunkards, and to sacrifice their delicacy by continuing to live in the society of drunkards. Mrs. N. stated her plan, which is that woman should meet in the primary assembly, and that her vote should be sent up to the Legislature in the same way that the returns are sent up from the separate times. It is said that if Stone's motion for going to the Maine Law, now as the Maine Law is not passed, it proves that woman is not represented. Mrs. N. spoke further upon the subject of voting—She has a very pleasing manner, and an agreeable elocution, marked with a playful sarcasm, that tells with considerable power.

Miss Lucy Stone, of Boston, took the platform in support of the resolution. She thought that the Temperance question should be taken up by the women, and that the liquor influence was never stronger than now. The power opposed to the moral force in favor of temperance is very great. I hope at this Convention we may gain a moral power, in that shall carry us on during the coming year, in our assaults upon the Rum interest.

Mr. Nichols, of Seneca Falls, said that he had been thus far to separate the sheep from the goats—the temperance men from their opponents. This labor has been very successful. I cannot but think that the cause is retrograding. I know that God is working with us. Man had carried the cause as far up the hill as he could. It was the part of humanity that gathers into our churches, to see human nature seems to manifest itself in very many ways in the church and out of it. Go through any community you please, penetrate into the nursery, the kitchen, the parlor, the places of merchandise, the market place and exchange, and who can tell the church member from the outsider? I see no reason why we should expect more of the church than of the world. Why, say you, they lay claim to greater holiness, to more rigid creeds, to a belief in a sterner God, to a closer observance of forms. The bible with them is a rule of life, the foundation of faith, and why should we not look to them for reforms of purity, goodness and truth above all other things? The assumption, therefore, on all sides called for themselves a higher position than the church. Our God is a God of justice, mercy, and truth. Their God sanctions violence, oppression and wine bibbing, and winks at gross, moral delinquencies. Our Bible commands us to love our enemies, to resist not evil, to break even, and to love them that oppress you free, and makes a noble life of more importance than a stern faith. Their Bible permits war, slavery, capital punishment, and makes salvation depend on faith and ordinances. In their creed it is a sin to dance, to pick up sticks on the sabbath day, to go to the theatre, to take large parties during Lent, to read a notice of any reformer, to lean from the altar, or permit a woman to speak in the church. In our creed it is a sin to hold a slave, to hang a man on the gallows, to make war on defenseless nations, or to sell rum to a weak brother, and rob the widow and the orphan of a protector and a home.

Thus may we see the difference of our creeds, but from the similarity in the product of the human family, it is fair to infer that our differences are more intellectual than spiritual, and all the great truths we bear so dearly uttered on all sides, have been incorporated as vital principles into the inner life of but few individuals.

We must not expect the Church to leap on a higher position. She sends forth her missionaries of truth one by one. All of our reformers have, in a measure, been developed in the world, and we have seen the growth of the advocates and opposers of the Reform of our day, have grown up side by side, partaking of the same ordinance, and officiating at the same altar, but one by applying more fully his christian principles to life, and pursuing an admitted truth to its legitimate results, has unwittingly found himself in antagonism with his brethren.

Belief is not voluntary, and change is the natural result of growth and development. We would have all reformers to be true to their principles of Temperance, but if the Church in her wisdom has made her platform so broad that wine bibbers and rum-sellers may repose in ease thereon, who are we to cry against the Church? It is our duty to complain. Having thus briefly noticed some of the objections to our movement, I will not detain the audience longer than this time.

The annual report of the Executive Committee was then read by Miss Vaughn. The society includes about 2 thousand members. The lecturing agents for the Society during the year have been Mrs. C. Vaughn, Emily Clark, Susan B. Anthony, H. A. Albro, and Miss Wright. The Lecturers have been eminently successful in their efforts, and are influencing for good. Thirty Conventions have been canvassed, and testimony is borne by the people and the press to the good accomplished. The Committee express pleasure in the success of the Society's Agents. Their efforts have been chiefly directed to the Maine Law.

Temperance papers and newspapers have been largely procured, and a subscriber list of the Society published 50,000 pages of tracts. They commend the importance of these little messengers to the attention of the Society. People will read these silent and unobtrusive teachings when they will not hear the living speaker.

The report then took up the subject of the drunkard's wife and her duties. The Executive Committee have offered a prize of \$10, for the first tract by a woman upon the relation of woman to the cause, and Mrs. Nichols has been requested to publish her views upon Divorce on the ground of intemperance. Temperance papers are then noticed, and the Liberator is chiefly commended, for its fearlessness and ability. Many of the Religious and Secular journals favor the Maine Law.

It is impossible to enumerate or to describe the evils which result directly from intemperance and from which women are the principal sufferers. Every man there, of all professions, equally and boldly, to withstand the progress of intemperance, and more recently to discountenance and discourage by all means in their power, the traffic in intoxicating drinks.

However, the sincere friends of temperance may have differed formerly, as to the best mode of promoting the Temperance Reform, and of finally banishing Intemperance from the country, as a general and prevailing vice. I believe, that at present all honest and intelligent friends of the cause, are in hearty and unanimous agreement, that the most probable and the most effectual way of doing so, is by the aid of the law, of the traffic in intoxicating drinks. Such a law involves no man's rights, respects upon no man's privileges. The first duty of every citizen is to do nothing to obstruct the will of the general good, and the duty of the State is to permit no man to do anything in violation of the general good. All laws are founded upon this principle, that such individual must submit to such rules as are deemed by the community to be for the good of the whole, or, as the old law man expressed it, "the welfare of the people is the supreme law."

While the traffic in strong drinks interferes with the rights of the community more than any other cause of evil combined, it is probable, that no good under any circumstances. It is absurd, therefore, to suppose that the community has no power to control this great evil, that any citizen has the right to neglect it, or that any society, or that society should hesitate to exercise its rights, and power of self protection against it.

Very Respectfully Yours, NEAL DOW. Portland, May 9, 1853. The President announced the following resolution from the business Committee and that Rev. Antoinette L. Brown would speak to it. Resolved, That woman as an intelligent and responsible being, equally with man, endowed by her Creator with capacities and energies, for the good use of which she is equally with man answerable to God, and has an equal right with man to co-operate with him in every movement which seeks the elevation, refinement, purity, peace and progress of humanity; and that as Daughter, Sister, Wife or Mother, woman has no right to appear to be indifferent to the Temperance Reform.

Rev. Miss Brown addressed the meeting. She had been surprised at hearing that she was expected to speak this evening. She should be brief, especially as Miss Lucy Stone, whom all were anxious to hear was to follow. She then proceeded to explain the general and able manner of the importance of temperance, and the miseries of drunkenness. The Reverend lady indulged largely in witty sallies and mirth provoking comparisons. She treated her hearers to a poetical and beautiful eulogium on pure water, which she said was "the poor man's wine." She then proceeded to speak of the influence of intemperance, and of which in a tube will balance the whole great ocean."

The President announced "Lucy Stone of Massachusetts." Miss Stone, who is a very pleasant and impressive young lady, in voice, manner, looks, and elocution, commenced by a promise not to follow. She then proceeded to speak historically of the Temperance cause. One step led to another till woman at length joined in the effort. She would propose still a new bar in the way of the drunkard's progress. The measure she proposed was not offered as from this Society—it is embodied in a resolution for which she has been called on by the meeting.

Resolved, That it is an unjust and unnatural law which should require a man or woman to live as the husband or wife of a confirmed drunkard—of which justice, and a true idea of those who live as the husband or wife of a confirmed drunkard, not only a legal separation for habitual drunkenness, but the right of divorce for those who ask it.

Miss Stone supported her resolution with much eloquent appeal and earnest argument. She drew a vivid picture of female degradation under the influence of intemperance, as exemplified in the wretched women in the tombs at New York, and asked what man would be bound in Matrimony with such a being. And why should that most abject of beings—a drunkard's wife, be tied through life to a brute? No drunkard has a right to have offspring. No woman has a right to give birth to a drunkard's child. No one should charge her with impropriety because she stood there and said those things. It was because she loved purity—the pure of the human soul—she did so. He is looked upon as a monster who entices his child to be a drunkard. But is not the man equally a monster who makes his child a drunkard before his birth? Divorce in the cases referred is not a right merely, but a solemn duty.

A question may arise, may not the man or woman who was once a drunkard but who shall reform, marry again. I say never! never! The constitution is ruined, tainted and lost. No such man or woman ever marry. Let the man so accused shun the curse from which he may be freed. While he holds the man in punishment for his wrong doing may we do so too. We need not be tender to the Infinite.

I know it is objected that the Bible allows but one, and that another, cause of Divorce. But my wife does not say so. It says, "Whatsoever ye do unto others shall do to you, do ye even so to them." And if I would not do ye another to be bound to an imbricate, so I do not find my Bible forbidding divorce from the drunkard. Yet if all the Bibles in the world were brought to me, and it were shown that they prohibited divorce except on adultery, I would lay them reverently aside, and placing my hand upon my heart, would say that my own soul was still more sacred than all books and parchments whatsoever. (Cheers.)

Mrs. Nichols, of Vermont, was next presented. She said she had been requested to speak of Divorce. She was opposed to making drunkenness a cause for divorce, because she could see that intemperance would ere long be legislated out of the land. She had appealed to the wives of drunkards. They have invariably replied, "No, No. We only ask the control of our children and our property, and we will wait till the Maine Law shall give us back our husbands as they are when sober—" (Applause.) The wives of drunkards are not asking a wholesale bill of divorce. They ask security in the possession of their earnings and their children. Mrs. N. was too much wearied and exhausted to proceed. Adjourned.

R's position, but said that the majority report must first be debated.

Mrs. Stebbins said the Society had a right to discuss and adopt either report. The minority report is not a negative report. It contains affirmative propositions. Mr. Cuyler deemed the whole debate useless. In the decision of the rejection of either report, the whole issue was involved, and he hoped that the debate be closed at half past 10.

The question was then taken on Miss Anthony's motion, and it was lost. Mr. Cuyler's motion was put and carried. The President said, it seems that all you men who have studied parliamentary law, disagree in regard to it, and who know nothing of such law, must fall back upon common sense.

A rambling and wrangling debate followed a motion to limit the speakers to five minutes each, and that no one shall be permitted to speak, who has already spoken, until others had enjoyed the privilege. Motion carried.

John W. Stebbins took the platform, to present the claims of the minority report. The minority should be heard fully, before the vote was taken. There was not a fair discussion of the report yesterday. At least three-fourths of the debate was confined to the fact that women

