

efforts to represent themselves as having heretofore occupied positions upon this question in perfect harmony with their present political creed. And when in accordance with the inspirations of your teachings, the political party with which I affiliate now announce that this emancipation policy, this radicalism which is to sweep away slavery in violation of all the principles of right, and in disregard of the sacred guarantees which protect private property; this confiscation of the estates of our Southern brethren, and this new dogma of "State suicide," or "State forfeiture" which obliterates sovereignties and leaves a *tabula rasa* upon which to erect the fabric of a consolidated despotism—are paving the way to a "treason far more potent for mischief than any assistance secession is likely to receive from abroad, or aid which treason at home may convey to it," let them be no longer denounced as "traitors." If our views of "treason" to the Constitution and Government of the United States and the State of Maryland agree with the definitions received so recently from *your* political Gamaliels, pardon or least do not denounce our more *consistent* adherence to the axioms of constitutional duty and obligation. I do not mean, Mr. President, thus to "succumb to the advancing tide of public opinion"—a public opinion that is changing and unstable—and bears the evident marks of a diseased condition of the body politic. My cheeks would tingle with shame, my limbs would grow weak and tremulous, and my manhood would desert me, if I could thus falsify the record of a lifetime, or stoop to utter such language of denunciation and venom as these walls have echoed and re-echoed since this debate commenced.

No, sir! I shall not bring dishonor on my name and parentage, or so tarnish the fair fame of the great, pure and good men who have preceded me in these halls of legislation, some of whom belong to that class of men who were not born to die. Should I do so, I would expect the very walls about me to echo in language which speaks from the tomb, or breathes its notes from the spirit world, a solemn reprimand—aye! voices of condemnation!

I do not purpose, Mr. President, to follow the gentlemen who have preceded me through their *biblical* arguments, through their discussions of the morality of slavery, and through their tables of statistics showing a variety of facts which are not the logical consequence of the existence or

non-existence of slavery, but which find their solution and *primal* cause in a variety of historical facts, distinctions of social organization and race, and questions of political economy which the limits of my allotted time do not permit me to discuss. Allow me to say, that while negro slavery has, like all other mere human institutions, some evils connected with it, it is not a *sin*—the argument and opinion of our clerical member (Mr. Todd) to the contrary notwithstanding. My interpretation of the *Bible*, as an Episcopalian, which differs very much from his, both as regards the doctrines and spirit of the Gospel dispensation, teaches me that slavery is *sanctioned* by it, and *I know divine revelation nowhere sanctions a malum in se*. With Bishop Hopkins, as pure and devout a Christian man as adorns the episcopacy, I believe and shall ever maintain "that the relation of the master to the slave in the Southern States involves no sin, provided the treatment of the slave be in accordance with the Scriptures; because the slavery of the heathen races was sanctioned by the divine law in the Old Testament, and the system of Roman slavery was allowed to Christians by the apostles in the New Testament; and it was regarded as a providential arrangement of society by the fathers, the councils, the theologians and commentators in every branch of the Church for more than eighteen centuries; so that there is no question on which the Holy Catholic Church was more perfectly unanimous; that by necessary consequence the modern doctrine of ultra abolitionists is an impious error, because it opposes the Bible and the Church; that it is a dangerous error, because it divides Christian communities into hostile sects, bitterly warring against each other; that it is rebellious to the State as well as to the Church, because it tramples on the Constitution, calling it a "covenant with death and an agreement with hell," and has driven the old Union of the States into discord and strife, of which no man can foretell the issue; that to the negro race, slavery in the hands of their Southern masters has been a blessing; * * that meanwhile, the Church has no right to interfere with the institution, warranted as it is, not only by the "supreme law of the land" laid down in the Constitution, but by the word of God and the unanimous judgment of Christendom." View of slavery by Bishop Hopkins, pp. 349, 350.

And in reply to all that has been said and deduced *illogically* from the citation of