

"A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach," &c.

Now, sir, when men argue that because the Apostles failed to denounce slavery in express terms therefore slavery is morally right, does not Brigham Young, with equal propriety argue that because they failed to prohibit a plurality of wives, therefore a plurality of wives is morally right? Certainly, sir. But no gentleman within the sound of my voice is willing to admit that Brigham Young's reasoning is good, and I contend with even greater propriety that the analogous reasoning of the friends of slavery is not good.

I think, sir, this reasoning shows conclusively why the Saviour of the world and his Apostles were not abolitionists, in the modern acceptance of that term, and why they did not command their followers to turn abolitionists, and why they did not teach them "that slavery in any form is wrong and ought to be immediately abolished;" yet it must not be forgotten that though the Apostles were not abolitionists, they did inculcate a principle, the effect of which among other things, was to uproot slavery in all parts of Europe where the Christian religion has become the predominating religion—it has already abolished slavery in the North, and it must abolish it in the South. The effect in our own State will be, that on or before the 1st of January next, the last vestige of slavery yet remaining in our State will be wiped out. Maryland will be a free State and no longer bound by a most unwholesome interest to the infamous rebellion which is now devastating some of the fairest districts of our country, wringing burning tears from the eyes of ten thousand widows in a single day, and which has made desolate almost every hearthstone from Maine to the Capes of Florida, from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains. By the operation of this old Apostolic principle, I repeat, that with the close of the present year slavery in Maryland which is already a dead carcass, will have received a decent interment, and its friends may, if they choose, erect a handsome monument to its memory. Maryland will then assume a position among her sister States which she has never occupied before; and, by being the first, since the beginning of the rebellion, to declare the debt of *paramount* allegiance which her citizens owe to the General Government, and the first to declare that slavery shall be immediately abolished—these being the declarations of a majority of her people—her boldness—her patriotism—her loyalty and her spirit of progress thus manifested will be the admiration of her sister States and of the world.

Mr. President: I was an emancipationist long before I was persuaded to believe that slavery in the South was a moral evil. I have never, at any period of my life, believed that it was morally wrong to emancipate a slave;

and entertaining this view, I have ever been in favor of the inauguration of some scheme, in this State, of emancipation, as a matter of public utility. I have ever believed that the effect of slavery in our State has been to paralyze the energies of the people; to prevent the education of the masses; to prevent the development of the resources of our State, for both agricultural and manufacturing purposes. Slavery has ever been an incubus upon the general prosperity and progress of the State, and to-day we are, in all the essentials necessary to constitute a great State, far behind many of our sister States.

I apprehend that it is not essentially necessary, in order to make it appear how slavery is the cause of the backwardness, the lethargy of the South, that I should enter into some metaphysical or cunningly-devised argument; that it is not necessary to make appear the effects of slavery on the mind of both the master and the slave, and how these effects become of themselves causes of the effects which we all deplore. Any stranger traveling through our country can see the effects of slavery, and know these to be the effects of slavery, without the necessity of inquiring into the process—the practical workings and operations of slavery by which these effects are brought about. A wayfaring man, though a fool, cannot err; and he knows that the reason why Maryland has not advanced as rapidly as her sister States north of Mason and Dixon's line, is because slavery is an institution here, and is not in those States. A brief comparison of a few of the Southern with a few of the Northern States will be amply sufficient to show the baneful effects of slavery in the South, and ought to be sufficient to induce all Marylanders to give a cheerful and hearty support to the cause of emancipation in our own State.

First, compare Maryland with Massachusetts. Maryland is, in the first place, a larger State than Massachusetts; her soil is far superior in natural fertility, and almost every acre of her territory is susceptible of cultivation and improvement. About one-third of the State of Massachusetts is not under cultivation, and never can be. She is very like a beggar out at his elbows and knees. There are high jagged rocks and deep indentures, with not a square inch of soil on or in them. Large tracts of country are barren wastes and never can afford sustenance for even the birds of the air, the wild beasts of the forest, or the cattle of the field.

Maryland has water resources for manufacturing purposes quite equal, if not superior, to those of Massachusetts. She has extensive coal and copper mines, of which Massachusetts is entirely destitute. Her climate is superior, being more salubrious and healthful. Her summers are longer and not excessively hot; her winters are shorter and not excessively cold; and our farmers may conduct