

tled to be considered *bona fide* settlers and "colonists," than their persecutors, most of whom are Americans, having no permanent stake in the country whatever.

Resolution No. 2 is chiefly applicable to the case in hand so far as it relates to "social usages." Neither Mr. Macfie nor myself having formed a church, no action you might take in regard to our procedure could possibly infringe upon the rights of any christian brotherhood. Had churches been organized by both of us however, for you to have affirmed the laws of Christ's house in their bearing on this case, would have involved no assumption of "lordship over God's heritage." From your relations to both of us, you not only might venture, but were imperatively required, to pronounce on our dispute, unappalled by the peril of being compelled to declare one or both of us in the wrong. As a matter of fact you *have* pronounced most emphatically, while disclaiming the right to do so, and taking the strange ground that *independency* as well as "sincere regard" for both of us forbade your interference! For one, I have no faith in *such* independency as gives a brother the warrant to act as Mr. Macfie has done. Judged on worldly principles, and apart from any question of right or wrong involved in the issue between us, his course has been most dishonorable and reprehensible. The laws of common courtesy have been grossly violated! Yet a Missionary Committee deliberately resolves that the church polity of Congregationalism shields him from censure, and demands that he be allowed to divide and undermine, to harass and alienate, "without blame or opposition" from anybody! I confess I find no such independency as this in the Bible. Nor can I be a party to the introduction in these young colonies of a system, which acknowledges no duty of courtesy, no right of sympathy, no relation of mutual dependence and mutual responsibility.

As to your disclaimer of all interference with existing "social usages," I cannot but regard the principle involved in it as most unsound, for the question is not, does a certain usage exist, but *is it right?* Had I found proscription of the colored man the social usage prevailing here, it would have been no less my duty to have opposed it. This second resolution carried out logically, would forbid a Christian minister setting himself against polygamy in Utah, slavery in the Southern States, lottery gambling in California, and open Sabbath desecration in your own favored England. It is the very plea set up by churches and societies in the United States which are mute about slavery. Not thus did the apostles deal with such "social usages" as were wrong in their day. Is it possible that the Broad church maxim, "do as other people do in a Christian country," holds sway in the councils of British Congregationalism? But even on your own premises, it is not I, but Mr. Macfie who must be condemned. I was no innovator, but only conformed quietly to the "usages" which I found established. Mr. Macfie was the *first* as I trust he will be the *last* minister of the gospel to set up a distinction between men in these colonies on the basis of color. I have in my possession the certificates kindly given for any use I may wish to make of them, of His Excellency Governor Douglas, and Lieutenant Governor Colonel Moody, as to the equal civil and political status of the colored man, with the white in these colonies:—the testimony of the Rev. E. Cridge, the first and for several years the only protestant clergyman on the island, also of the Rev. R. J. Dundas to the effect that in their congregations colored persons have always been treated precisely as others: the declaration of the Rev. Dr. Evans, Wesleyan Missionary, that no distinction has ever been made in the "accommodations and courtesies" provided and extended in connection with his ministry, and finally a particularly kind letter of sympathy and approval from his Lordship the Bishop of Columbia in reference to my course. Judged therefore on your own principles, Mr. Macfie merited at your hands, the severest reprehension, because finding a "social usage" in existence, and that usage right and scriptural, he did not co-operate with those who sought to make it uniform and permanent.

With reference to the 3rd Resolution, it is sufficient to say that you endorsed my exercise of discretionary power before news of the dispute reached you. Six weeks prior to Mr. Macfie's appearance on the scene, I wrote you as to the existence of the prejudice against color in some quarters, and told you what line of action I felt it my duty to pursue. I said, "of course I shall give place to this foolish