the will of the superior. He cannot be the equal of the white man; but his very being depends upon slavery to the white man, or his equal in all the civil, social, and industrial pursuits of life. His being can only be perpetuated in this country by slavery or by equality. The latter relation being an absurdity, the former becomes essential to his existence. The Indian race were neither equal to us, nor were they our slaves; they are gone—

"Like April snow in the warm noon, they will melt away,
And swift we follow as they go towards the setting day."

Nature never fitted them to be our equals, and we preferred the negro for slaves. See the result; for every slave brought to this country, we now have ten. On the other hand, the millions of Indians in possession of our country when first settled, have nearly disappeared. But they had a western forest to retreat to—where would our free negroes go when the storm of the white man's rage shall burst upon him? Those who wish the extermination of the negro race should favor their freedom; those whose minds can penetrate beneath the surface of the negro problem, and whose religion consists in good will to man and reverence to God's eternal laws—should favor their slavery.

It is remarkable that the Almighty God has signalized the institution of slavery in so many instances with his approbation and favor. When Hagar fled from her mistress, Sarah, because of her chastisements, the angel of the Lord said, "*Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hand.*" Hagar was a *bona fide* slave of Abraham, in all respects, as any of our slaves now are to us.

Again the Almighty sanctifies the institution of slavery in the case of Joseph, to preserve the lives of the Egyptians and of the Israelites. Had slavery been a moral wrong, would God have used it to carry out his benign purpose? Did God ever sanction sin in any age of the world or for any purpose? Our Saviour said—"*Verily I have not found so great faith; no, not in Israel*"—as where? Why, as in this slaveholding century!—Paul executed the fugitive slave law in good faith 1800 years before our Act of 1850 was passed. All the apostles speak of slavery as one of the cardinal relations of life, and in the same category as husbands and wives, parents and children, government and citizen. Where's the wrong? Not in the Bible or in the nature of things. Where then? No where—except in the "higher law" treason that seeks to abolish negro slavery, in order to substitute white slavery to capital, as is now the case in Europe.

I might consider my task completed—yes, I wish I could now take my seat. But a stern duty—painful, disagreeable—a duty the discharge of which may bring upon me denunciation and persecution from certain quarters—still remains to be performed. I cannot flinch from it. It is a task not self imposed, not assumed, not courted by me; it has been thrust upon me by an agency outside of the State of Maryland; and unless I am willing to have my name cast out as evil, my motives impugned, my religion scoffed at, and my character vilified, I cannot see how to escape the performance of this duty.

Mr. President—On the 3d and 4th days of November last a Convention of Delegates from the Eastern Shore counties met in Cambridge to devise means for the better regulation and control of the negro population of that Shore. They quietly and prudently suggested such remedies as they thought the circumstances required, and peacefully retired to their homes. I was a member of that Convention, and took an humble share in its deliberations. The papers of our own State published the proceedings of that Convention pretty generally, but without much comment on the matter.

To my surprise, nay, to my sorrow and regret, the Christian Advocate and Journal, published in New York, and one of the (if not *the*) leading paper of the Methodist Episcopal Church, came out in a long editorial of two columns, on 25th November, denouncing the doings of that Convention in the most earnest and bitter terms. After publishing the preamble and resolutions it says: "It (the Convention) is the second re action, within twenty years, against the necessary progress of society in Maryland!" No insult could be more cutting than this. for by the word "society" equality between free negroes and our white citizens is clearly implied.—Again—"This movement is precisely similar to the one of 1841–2, so successfully resisted by Bishop Waugh, the Rev. Robert Emory, and other members of the M. E. Church." Again—"The act of 1842 called forth a vehement storm from the ministry of the Methodist Church."

Again, "Memorials were circulated, signed and forwarded from Baltimore to Annapolis by Bishop Waugh and the Rev. Robert Emory."—Again, "Public meetings were held in the Light Street and Exeter Street Methodist Churches, and energetic speeches were delivered by the Rev. Robert Emory, in opposition to the measures of the slaveholders."—Again, "In 1842, as in 1858, the slaveholders resorted to the most desperate allegations respecting the free negroes, we do not believe that their statements were true then, we do not believe that they are true now." That is telling us plainly that we lie! After throwing the lash freely and plying the spur to the members of the Methodist Church, it "recommends to all good Methodists in Maryland to keep their eye on this matter." They will certainly do that without commanding them, for the Methodists of Maryland are as tired of free negroism as any others in the State.

The editor of the Advocate flourishes the ecclesiastical cowhide over the members of the Methodist Church in Maryland, and tells them what he intends to do and what they are required to do by this foreign, outside, Theocratic power. He says: "We have proposed to speak in due time on the subject of slavery before the session of the next General Conference in 1860! So the Methodists are to stand still and tremble with awe and terror till the organ speaks in 1860! But he does not stop here; he *commands* them "to remember their colored brethren as they did in 1841–2!" Does the editor mean that *all free negroes are our brethren!* He certainly must; for the action of the Cambridge Convention included all, without exception. We think the Methodists of Maryland will hardly submit to this degradation. The editor further threatens the civil power of the State in these words: "Methodists are not Methodist politicians, *but they will have politicians understand they will meet it* (*this question*) *both as Christians and citizens!*" I hurl back into the teeth of the editor of that journal this insinuation upon the loyalty and devotion of the Methodist people of Maryland to the civil authorities of the State. I am a Methodist myself, have been a member of that church for 26 years past, and it is the first time I have learned that my civil allegiance is be subordinate to ecclesiastical dictation.

The members of the Methodist Church in Maryland are, in the main, quiet, peaceable, law-abiding, devoted Christians. They are as good citizens as any other portion of our population. They are devoted to the church of their choice, and have done as much as any other denomination to promote the glory of God amongst men, and hasten the advent of the kingdom of grace in the world. I say this much to the *members*, I can also say as much for a persecuted *minority* of the ministers of the Philidelphia Conference—men who are struggling hard to maintain their church connections without violating any of their civil obligations due to the State.—But neither the members nor the minority of ministers are to

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)

1859