

ually insist that Christ was not hostile to Slavery, because he nowhere in express terms condemned it; but if he had done so, and such men as have hitherto controlled the issues of the Tract Society had been allowed to edit and publish the Gospels, the modern world would have been kept in ignorance of the fact. And we apprehend that such works as bear explicit testimony against the sin and wrong of slaveholding will henceforth be deemed "not adapted to the design of the Society in their original form"—and that will be the upshot of *this* resolution.

"As to the proceeding, it seems to be calculated rather to "darken counsel" than frankly to affirm and declare a line of policy on a most momentous question. Among "those moral duties which grow out of the existence of Slavery," is the duty of abolishing Slavery included, or is it not? Does the Tract Society consider the naked act of making a poor and ignorant woman labour through life and bear children, for the benefit of an intelligent and powerful man whom the State declares her master, right or wrong? Among "those moral evils and vices which Slavery is known to promote," is the enforcement of unpaid service or is it not recognized? And will the Society publish and circulate tracts which, "in a fraternal and Christian spirit," exhibit the inherent and inevitable wrong of slaveholding, and the Christian duty of abstaining from and discountenancing it? This is the vital point, and on this point the Report fails to enlighten us. We must await, then, the acts which are to give significance to this non-luminous congeries of words before we can join in exultation over yesterday's doings by the Tract Society."