a state of amelioration from the first; for they have not only improved under it, but in being brought here to serve the white man, their real superior, they were delivered from a far worse servitude at home, where three-fourths of the native population have been slaves from time immemorial to masters of their own colour as brutal as themselves. As a general thing the slave traders on the coast of Africa have never procured any negroes except such as were slaves there. We are not justifying the slave traffic by any implication—we only take facts as they are and look at results. By what means, in the gradual progress of time, the coloured population in our country may be transferred to their native shores, bearing with them the benefits of their improved condition, it is not for us now to conjecture. If disturbing influences were kept away, if things were allowed to take their own course, under the benign government of Providence, operating by the wholesome influences of increasing light and true benevolence upon the unforced will, the great problem would doubtless be solved in such a manner as to shed resplendent glory on the civilization of the age, adding at the same time new illustrations of the beauty and excellence of free institutions.

REV. GEORGE BROWN AGAIN.

In our last we copied from the Liberia Herald a letter from this gentleman complaining of treatment received at the hands of the Rev. Squire Chase, superintendent of the Methodist Liberia Mission.

We now lay before our readers the reply to the same by the Rev. Mr. Chase, contained in the Africa's Luminary, received since the publication of Mr. Brown's letter. As we said before, we do not, even in feeling, take sides in this controversy, or enter into the merits of the question at issue between them; but we regret to find that Mr. Chase is not able to disavow the use of language attributed to him by Mr. Brown, thereby admiting the application of the terms, "*liar and black scoundrel*," to the latter gentleman. "Brethren, these things ought not so to be."

SUPREMACY.—The Liberia Herald for January contains a letter from the Rev. G. S. Brown, under the following imposing title: "Supremacy of the power of the Liberian Discipline, to that of the Discipline of the M. E. Church." To prove and illustrate his meaning in this proposition or allegation, the author of the letter, after complaining of being himself under the power of the Liberian Discipline, because suspended from all official services in the church, until the next session of the same quarterly meeting conference that saw proper to thus suspend him, endeavours to establish the illegality of this proceeding by quoting two paragraphs from the 72 and 73 pages of the Discipline of the M. E. Church.

And because his case was not disposed of in the way mentioned in his quotation, he infers that the proceedings must have been *extra-judicial*, or out of proper court. But by referring to page 70 of the Book of Discipline of the M. E. Church, it will be found that "the quarterly conference have authority" among other things, "to try, *suspend*, expel or acquit any local preacher in the circuit or station against whom charges may be brought." This clause of the Discipline clearly shows that the quarterly conference have an *original* "cognizance" of complaints, &c. against local preachers, and can both "try" and "suspend," as well as "expel or acquit" them, just as the evidence in any given case may require.

The Rev. Mr. B. therefore is much mistaken when he says the Discipline "requires *either* to expel or acquit" the accused, thus *denying* its

right to "suspend," which, it has been shown, is expressly given in the Book of Discipline. If it be asked how these two portions of the Discipline are consistent with each other, the answer is by no means difficult.

The paragraphs quoted by Mr. B., contain the provision for a *formal* hearing and disposal of charges against a local preacher, *in the intervals* of the sessions of the quarterly conference of the circuit or station where he may belong, but if an offence be committed either too late for this process, or under circumstances that render such a procedure either impracticable or very inconvenient, then the next session of the quarterly conference has *original cognizance* in the case, as already shown by the paragraph we have quoted. The fitness of *both* these provisions appears thus: if a local preacher should offend against the Discipline of our church immediately *after* his quarterly conference has risen, and local preachers *can be had*, the preacher in charge can proceed against the offending brother, and acquital or suspension follows of course; but in case there is not the required number of *local* preachers that can be obtained, or the sickness or necessary absence of witnesses prevents *this form* of investigation, then the next quarterly conference for that circuit or station can take the *first* cognizance of the case, and dispose of it according to their judgment, in view of evidence adduced.

Were it not for this power of the quarterly conference a local preacher might be in circumstances to do as he pleased, and *bid defiance* to the Discipline of the church, either because there were no other local preachers in the country, or not the required number for a committee; and should the local preachers, *now* recommended for admission into the Liberia Mission Annual Conference, be received at its ensuing session, there would be *only two* left this side of Cape Palmas. It was, doubtless, in foresight of such emergencies, that the General Conference of the M. E. Church made this *two-fold* provision in the case of offending local preachers.

Thus we have shown Mr. B's error in reference to the "suspending" power of the quarterly conference, but he asks "to what was I suspended?" and answers that it was not "to the annual conference." No, certainly not, for that body can only take cognizance of the case in the form of *an appeal*, AFTER expulsion by the *quarterly* conference. See page 73 of the Book of Discipline. As, then, the quarterly conference *has* the power to suspend, as we have seen, it can be only in reference to a *subsequent* hearing at one of its regular sessions, and the next, in order of time, as a matter of course.

But Mr. B's mode of stating his question is quite characteristic, asking what he was "suspended *to*," when the suspension is, "*from* all official services *until* the next session of the conference which has suspended him."

But Mr. B. complains that no charges with specifications were presented, nor a single witness brought, neither any notification of his trial.

Now the facts in the case are briefly these; after we had declined allowing Mr. B's account, (for reasons we shall soon state,) he went out and spread the evil report to which he has now given currency through the Herald; but there was no direct evidence on either side, except *his* and *our* individual and *very different* statements of the matter, and, of course, either might have more or less credence given to it, in proportion to the supposed credibility of either party, or the particular prejudices of individuals in the community.

Under these circumstances, although in consequence of Mr. B's gross misrepresentations of the matter, we might have brought a charge for slander against him, and *required* him to prove by some evidence, *other* than his own testimony, the allegations he had made, yet as we knew this was out of his power, from the very nature of the case, and as the required

Maryland Historical Society

The Maryland State Colonization Society Papers

XII. Newspapers
A. Maryland Colonization Journal

2. June 1841 (n.s. I, 1)—May 1861 (n.s. X, 24)

1843