

"39. And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee; thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant:

"40. But as an hired servant, and as a sojourner he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee:

"41. And then shall he depart from thee, with he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return.

"42. For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen.

"43. Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shalt fear thy God.

"44. But thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.

"45. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession.

"46. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession. they shall be your bondmen forever: but even your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor."

There were two classes of servants under the Jewish dispensation, those who were to serve for a term of years, and to go out "in the year of Jubilee"—the other class, the bondmen and bondmaids, who were the children of strangers, "to be an inheritance, a possession and bondmen forever." Thus it will be seen, sir, that the gentleman is as faulty in his Biblical reading as in some of his notions.

Now, sir, as regards the moral aspect of this question, I will not detain the Convention. Those who have no slaves need give themselves no trouble as to the morality of it. If there be sin in it, that sin does not rest on them. Any person who will take the Bible and read it, and read the commentators, must, it seems to me, have no difficulty as to the morality and right to hold slaves. If it be not clearly laid down in the Bible as an existing institution, before the coming of the Saviour, and during his stay on earth, and the duty of both slave and master alike defined and regulated, then I do not understand the import of language. It has existed in all times and among all people, in some form or other, even in the days of the occupancy of the garden of Eden, in a modified form, ever since the morning stars first sang together, for dominion was given to the husband and the wife was made subject to his rule. Of course, sir, that was not the slavery of the present day—but I use it merely to show the subjection of the one class to the other. And, sir, it exists to-day, in Boston, in Massachusetts,

in New York, in New England and in Old England, substantially, just as much as it exists in the Southern States. Call it by what name you may, but in the over-crowded workshops and manufactories of the North and of England, the wretched, miserable operatives are bound, body and soul, as they toil and struggle for the bare sustenance of life, just as strongly to a master as the slaves of the South. The only substantial difference is, that the one class can change their employers, and the other cannot. We all know what is the condition of Southern slavery, and I assert, without a fear of successful contradiction, that the whole earth does not show a community of laborers better fed, better clothed, better cared for, or better contented with their condition, more free from care, more joyous and more happy, than the negroes of the South. At least such was the case before the influx of abolitionists. Now, let us see what a distinguished writer has said of the factory operatives and laboring poor of England, and their condition is at least quite as tolerable as that of the like classes in Puritanical New England. Joseph Kay, in his work on the social condition of the people of England, says: "I speak it with sorrow and with shame, but with not the less confidence, that our peasantry are more ignorant, more demoralized, less capable of helping themselves and more pauperized, than those of any country in Europe, if we except Russia, Turkey, South Italy, and some parts of the Austrian Empire. The laborer has no longer any connection with the land he cultivates, he has no stake in the country, he has nothing to lose, nothing to defend, and nothing to hope for. His position is one of hopeless and irremediable dependence. The workhouse stands near him, pointing out his dismal fate, if he falls one step lower. In the civilized world there are fewer sadder spectacles than the present contrast in Great Britain, of unbounded wealth and luxury, with the starvation of thousands and tens of thousands, crowded into cellars and dens, without ventilation or light, compared with *which the wigwam of the Indian is a palace*. Misery, famine, brutal degradation, in the neighborhood of stately mansions which ring with gayety and dazzle with pomp and unbounded profusion, shock us as no other wretchedness does."

Of the pauperism, he says: "Large and ever-increasing hordes of vagrants or wandering beggars infest all the highways of England and Wales. These poor wretches are miserably clothed, filthily dirty, covered with vermin, and generally very much diseased. In some of the towns the degradation is such, that parents often cause the death of their children in order to obtain the premiums from the societies." He says their lodging apartments are generally cellars, ten or twelve feet square, with frequently no window, the