

Charles L. Redmond spoke in continuation of the same subject. He read from the *Emancipator* a piece headed, "Proposed Memorial to England," for the discontinuance [of] diplomatic relations with America. He spoke in reference to said document, and declared his satisfaction at seeing such a measure proposed. He also, as the audience at that period of the meeting was small, said that [the] smallness of number in attendance does not always [-gue] want of interest or lack of prosperity. He then spoke of the mighty change in public opinion, and said that discussion on the subject of American Slavery had found its way into public and private assemblies, Conferences, Synods, Associations, Legislatures, and the Halls of Congress,—that public opinion in reference to Slavery was piratical, and the American Government is piratical, &c. *The only freemen of this nation are the two hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders. If white men would be free themselves, they must sever the fetters of the slaves south of Mason & Dixon's line!*

These assertions, though they may be strong, are true. [...]

C.L. Redmond then read a piece concerning Geo. Thompson's election to the British Parliament, and alluding to the abusive opposition Mr. T. had met with when he was in this country, and to the assertions of his enemies here that he had run away from his own country. While England, said Mr. Redmond, has but one King or Queen, we have 250,000 Kings at the South, who give us their commands; when Slavery wants anything done, they walk up to the object, and will have it, whether the Church will consent or not—whether the people at the North will or not. "If you don't let us have it, we will divide the Union," &c. But the North wants to see if the Church will consent or no! When

Charles L. Remond spoke in continuation of the same subject. He read from the *Emancipator* a piece headed, "Proposed Memorial to England," for the discontinuance of diplomatic relations with America. He spoke in reference to said document, and declared his satisfaction at seeing such a measure proposed. He also, as the audience at that period of the meeting was small, said that the smallness of the number in attendance does not always argue want of interest or lack of prosperity. He then spoke of the mighty change in public opinion, and said that discussion on the subject of American Slavery had found its way into public and private assemblies, Conferences, Synods, Associations, Legislatures, and the Halls of Congress,—that public opinion in reference to Slavery was piratical, and the American Government is piratical, &c. *The only freemen of this nation are the two hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders. If white men would be free themselves, they must sever the fetters of the slaves south of Mason & Dixon's line!*

These assertions, though they may be strong, are true. very. C. L. Remond then read a piece concerning Geo. Thompson's election to the British Parliament, and alluding to the abusive opposition Mr. T. had met with when he was in this country, and to the assertions of his enemies here that he had run away from his own country. While England, said Mr. Remond, has but one King or Queen, we have 250,000 Kings at the South, who give us their commands; when Slavery wants anything done, they walk up to the object, and will have it, whether the Church will consent or not—whether the people at the North will or not. "If you don't let us have it, we will divide the Union," &c. But the North wants to see if the Church will consent or no! When

John Quincy Adams advocated the right to petition, he advocated a God-given right to pray; and when he was insulted in Congress, New England was insulted. If I must be a slave, let me be the slave of a southern slaveholder, as Henry Clay, of Kentucky, or James K. Polk, of Tennessee, and not the slave of a northern pale dough-face. Northern men are asleep to their civil rights. If a northern man goes into office, he goes in on all-fours, committed to Slavery. We have not a foreign minister who dares to speak of God and Liberty, because the South will not send him.

[Mr. Stephens said that the people, if dissatisfied with the Government, ought to call a general Convention, North and South, for amendment. It was the people, not the Constitution, who were wrong. The action of Congress was the reason of the existence of Slavery in the District of Columbia, in Florida, Alabama, and Texas. He declared the decision of the Supreme Court in reference to the three South American slaves, or fugitives, very unjust. He said Congress has power to abolish the slave trade between one State and another, and also in the District of Columbia. There was no difference, he said, between a monarchy in one, or in a thousand or ten thousand, or anything short of an individual power in all,—idiots and persons incapable of wielding the elective franchise excepted. A Government, to be a republic, must secure to all male adults the elective franchise. Congress has power to undo whatever any previous Congress has done. I will not, therefore, go for the dissolution of the Union, so long as I have power to wield the elective franchise. The Legislature, under this Constitution, has no right to make persons slaves:

John Quincy Adams advocated the right of petition, he advocated a God-given right to pray; and when he was insulted in Congress, New England was insulted. If I must be a slave, let me be the slave of a southern slaveholder, as Henry Clay, of Kentucky, or James K. Polk, of Tennessee, and not the slave of a northern pale dough-face. Northern men are asleep to their civil rights. If a northern man goes into office, he goes in on all-fours, committed to Slavery. We have not a foreign minister who dares to speak for God and Liberty, because the South will not send him.

Mr. Stephens said that the people, if dissatisfied with the Government, ought to call a general Convention, North and South, for amendment. It was the people, not the Constitution, who were wrong. The action of Congress was the reason of the existence of Slavery in the District of Columbia, in Florida, Alabama, and Texas. He declared the decision of the Supreme Court in reference to the three South American slaves, or fugitives, very unjust. He said Congress has power to abolish the slave trade between one State and another, and also in the District of Columbia. There was no difference, he said, between a monarchy in one, or in a thousand or ten thousand, or anything short of an individual power in all,—idiots and persons incapable of wielding the elective franchise excepted. A Government, to be a republic, must secure to all male adults the elective franchise. Congress has power to undo whatever any previous Congress has done. I will not, therefore, go for the dissolution of the Union, so long as I have power to wield the elective franchise. The Legislature, under this Constitution, has no right to make persons slaves:

the reasons why are, that the Constitution originally inhibited Slavery. Slavery only exists now as a local institution, anywhere in the United States. He said, if these United States were divided, there would be feuds and bloodshed; these two nations would be involved in war. I am not one of these who would be afraid of these results; but that these would be the results, I clearly see. Three or four thousand free white labourers in the South are almost as much degraded as the slaves themselves.]

C. L. Redmond said he had nothing to do with results, but left them to that God who would maintain the rights of the injured; and he further remarked, that Mr. Stephens' argument, although otherwise designed, confirmed him more in his views in reference to the first resolution, in opposition to which Mr. Stephens' remarks were intended.

Wednesday, 15th.—Met pursuant to adjournment. C. L. R. said, show me an Anti-Slavery Constitution and Government and an Anti-Slavery people and I will show you an Anti-Slavery or free nation. He then told an anecdote of a little boy who was once seen crying in the street, when one of the passers by asked him why he cried so. He replied, I am hurt. Well, don't cry, it wont hurt to-morrow. Well, then, said the boy, I will not cry to-morrow. So I say in reference to my feelings for my country, when it is free I will not cry or feel so either. He then referred to the case of George Lattimer, for whose freedom a large sum of money was paid in the old Bay State. What is it to George Lattimer, William Brown, and Frederick Douglass, &c. that the word slave was not in the Constitution is the last resource unto which I would flee for

the reasons why are, that the Constitution originally inhibited Slavery. Slavery only exists now as a local institution, anywhere in the United States. He said, if these United States were divided, there would be feuds and bloodshed; these two nations would be involved in war. I am not one of those who would be afraid of these results; but that these would be the results, I clearly see. Three or four thousand free white labourers in the South are almost as much degraded as the slaves themselves.

C. L. Remond said he had nothing to do with results, but left them to that God who would maintain the rights of the injured; and he further remarked, that Mr. Stephens' argument, although otherwise designed, confirmed him more in his views in reference to the first resolution, in opposition to which Mr. Stephens' remarks were intended.

Adjourned until to-morrow at 10 o'clock, A. M.

Wednesday, 15th.—Met pursuant to adjournment. C. L. R. said, show me an Anti-Slavery Constitution and Government and an Anti-Slavery people and I will show you an Anti-Slavery or free nation. He then told an anecdote of a little boy who was once seen crying in the street, when one of the passers by asked him why he cried so. He replied, I am hurt. Well, dont cry, it wont hurt to-morrow. Well, then, said the boy, I will not cry to-morrow. So I say in reference to my feelings for my country, when it is free I will not cry or feel so either. He then referred to the case of George Lattimer, for whose freedom a large sum of money was paid in the old Bay State. What is it to George Lattimer, William Brown, and Frederick Douglass, &c. that the word slave was not in the Constitution when they were slaves. Were I a slave, the Constitution is the last resource unto which I would flee for

protection. *Shame! on the Constitution!* I did not get up to make a speech, but our friend Stephens yesterday was afraid of consequences. Have we not had broils already. Who dare go South and advocate liberty principles? Has not the South been gradually butchering every sixth person! What have I to do with broils between Louisville and Cincinnati.

Mr. Redmond thought our friend got up his arguments very well on the other side, as well as Douglass on this side. No need of power to create Slavery; it existed before, and the fact, that the Constitution did not abolish it—proves its pro-slavery character. One million and a half dollars was demanded of England, to which Mr. Addington refers; he thinks sufficient arguments have been introduced in every instance. The fact that the fugitive is not protected, proves its pro-slavery character. No coloured man can step on the soil except he be liable to seizure if he cannot prove that his great great grandfather was a free man. The reason why we cannot stand up for the Constitution is, because it does not stand up for us; if it be not for us, it is against us. If the three million slaves of America could in an hour be set down in England, or even among the Arabs, they would be free, every fetter would be severed, and yet, there are those who tell us to be calm, and wait a little longer. I think our country needs to be civilized, because there is no other country in the world—where is found such a damning sin as that of American Slavery.

protection. *Shame! on the Constitution!* I did not get up to make a speech, but our friend Stephens yesterday was afraid of consequences. Have we not had broils already. Who dare go South and advocate liberty principles? Has not the South been gradually butchering every sixth person! What have I to do with broils between Louisville and Cincinnati.

Mr. Remond thought our friend got up his arguments very well on the other side, as well as Douglass on this side. No need of power to create Slavery; it existed before, and the fact, that the Constitution did not abolish it—proves its pro-slavery character. One million and a half dollars was demanded of England, to which Mr. Addington refers; he thinks sufficient arguments have been introduced in every instance. The fact that the fugitive is not protected, proves its pro-slavery character. No coloured man can step on the soil except he be liable to seizure if he cannot prove that his great great grandfather was a free man. The reason why we cannot stand up for the Constitution is, because it does not stand up for us; if it be not for us, it is against us. If the three million slaves of America could in an hour be set down in England, or even among the Arabs, they would be free, every fetter would be severed, and yet, there are those who tell us to be calm, and wait a little longer. I think our country needs to be civilized, because there is no other country in the world—where is found such a damning sin as that of American Slavery.