

penitentiary for no other offence than teaching negro children to read in Sunday Schools.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. The gentleman knows nothing about the institution of slavery. He knows nothing about the laws passed by slaveowners in slave States for their protection. He knows nothing about the domestic control and management of them and the attention paid to their religious instruction. He knows nothing about the attachment of the slave to the master or the master to the slave, and the sacredness with which they are regarded as members of his family. If his mind was more enlightened he would hold a better position here, and other views more consonant with justice, equity, religion and government. Does the gentleman know that in every slave State in the Union, the very strictest attention is paid to the moral and religious welfare of the slaves? Does he know that in the far South the large planters have churches built on their plantations, and employ ministers at a salary of \$1,000 to \$1,500 per year with the sole view of instructing their slaves in the wise teachings of the Bible? There the master and slave in fulness of heart worship the same God under the same vine and fig tree.

Mr. SCOTT. That does not meet my objection, that they do not teach them to read. They have the Scriptures expounded to them, but they are not allowed to read for themselves.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. Is it indispensable that a man should know how to read, in order to understand the teachings of the Bible and to be a Christian?

Mr. SCOTT. That is my idea exactly.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I tell the gentleman it is not indispensable. Does he not know that religion is a thing of the heart, and virtue the promptings of the heart? When you teach one in the ways of religion, no matter how ignorant he may be, in the rudiments of education, his mind will become enlightened and imbued with the principles of religion and virtue which will make him a good and Christian man.

They are not capable of self-government. History shows that they will retrograde rather than improve, in a state of freedom. They require a governing, a directing hand. This is the experience of the past. Whenever they have been put in a state of freedom they have become demoralized, and there is not one instance where their condition has been improved.

Are they the equal of the white man? Do gentlemen on this floor desire to make them the equal of the white man in all the civil and social relations. This equality was never thought of until lately, under the new teaching of miscegenation. I suppose the gentlemen are for that. On, on, you go, step by step. You recklessly go from one thing to another. You first liberate them, then

give them the civil rights of citizens, and then for intermarriage and the commingling of the races.

Mr. SCOTT. I rise to a point of order, which is this—Whether any gentleman has a right to impute to others arguments which they have never uttered and views which they have never advocated?

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. If the gentleman had paid attention to my argument he would have found that I made no personal application of my argument and conclusions to any one gentleman here. I simply suggested the result of this movement. I suggested that it would end in this, and before my God I believe it will, if you go on as you have commenced the work of pulling down our State Government and destroying all the rights of the citizens.

They are not mentally the equal of the white man; they are not physically the equal of the white man, for their organization is different, so intended by nature; a distinctive mark was placed upon them, and all the changes of time cannot efface it. Then is it proper, is it right, is it wise? Are you advantaging these people to make them free?

It has been said here that holding slaves is contrary to the teachings of the Bible. Now, I want to show gentlemen, that in almost every book, from Genesis to Revelations, slavery is clearly recognized in the Bible. But, said the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Cushing) day before yesterday, and the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott) night before the last, that they thought we were driven to a *dernier* resort when we went to the Bible in support of slavery. What, Mr. President, to offer the evidence of the Bible in support of an institution a *dernier* resort; that book of all books, the very fullness of every evidence, the fountain of all our hopes, and from which alone we can draw the motives to every action; the teachings of all truth, virtue and religion. What, sir, at this day of boasted civilization, at this day of advanced religious sentiments, to hold the Bible in so little respect, to proclaim such sentiments in an enlightened assemblage, must be revolting to every thinking mind, and I defy the gentlemen to offer any evidence that will be superior to the teachings of the Bible. Driven to extremity because we refer to the Bible, the book from which we draw our very life and breath; the teachings of the great I AM, the ruler and controller of all things. Driven to extremity because we resort to the Bible. Do the gentlemen believe in the Bible? Do they believe in the teachings of our Saviour? Have their consciences become so seared by the workings of fanaticism that even the Bible contains no teachings for them. If so, then God help them.

Now, I propose to show from the Bible