

of his services. Need I refer to any more Scripture passages?

Mr. SANDS. I would like to have my friend read the whole of the text in the case of Onesimus. I am somewhat familiar with it, and would like to hear it read.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I will read it, if the gentleman desires it. I commence at the tenth verse.

"I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds;

Which in time past was to thee unprofitable; but now profitable to thee and to me;

Whom I have sent again; thou therefore receive him, that is, mine own bowels;

Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the Gospel;

But without thy mind would I do nothing; that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly.

For perhaps he therefore departed for a reason, that thou shouldst receive him forever.

Not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord?

If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself.

If he hath wronged thee or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account;

I, Paul, have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it; albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides."

It would be useless for me to refer further to the Bible, in support of my position that slavery is a divine institution. It is just as much sacred, and so held under both the dispensations, as the rite of marriage. The same authority that said—"wives obey your husbands"—"Husbands, cleave unto your wives"—the same authority gave the injunction—"servants obey your masters." I say it is of the same divine origin, and can never be destroyed under God.

The difference between the gentlemen and ourselves, is that very difference that St. Paul suggested to the Athenians, on his visit to Athens. As he was passing by he saw a temple erected with the inscription, "To the unknown God." They are like the Athenians; they do not worship the God of our salvation. Whilst we worship the God of our fathers whose teachings are full of wisdom, truth and justice, they, like the Egyptians who made every beast their God, have erected a temple to the negro, at which they not only offer up their devotions at morn and eve, but it seems to claim their continual devotions.

We next come to consider whether the necessity of the times require that slavery should be abolished in this State. Is there any necessity for it?

What are the reasons assigned why slavery

should be abolished in this State? They say that it affords material aid to the rebellion. Is that true? Is that applicable to the State of Maryland, or to any of the border States not in rebellion? I think the transverse of the proposition is true. I contend that in the border States slavery aids and abets the Government of the United States in putting down the rebellion. What do you do by abolishing slavery in the State of Maryland? You take away at once \$40,000,000 worth of property, and almost as much in the yearly productive industry of the State. That property is now paying a tax for the support of the General Government as well as for the support of the State Government. Remove it and where are your taxes to come from? Will we be enabled to contribute to the same extent to carry on this war against the rebellion if our slaves are taken away, our productive industry paralyzed, from which alone we pay our taxes? Is not rather the transverse of the proposition, as stated by the gentlemen, true? You take away \$40,000,000 worth of property now subject to taxation, and all the productive industry of the State amounting to almost as much more yearly, which now contributes to the payment of taxes for carrying on this war. That proposition may be true in the case of States in immediate rebellion against the Government. But the principle does not apply to Maryland, and I am astonished that men of sense should advance such arguments.

I understand that the majority of this Convention propose to free the slaves without compensation. Now, I want it distinctly understood beforehand that I shall oppose the abolition of slavery, no matter under what phase it is presented to this Convention, and with God's will and the assistance of this strong arm will try to defeat the proposition before this people, if you pass it here. But was there ever heard such an outrage against the rights of the citizens of any State, as to propose to take from them \$40,000,000 worth of property—say, more, at the time this war broke out, the slave property in this State amounted to \$80,000,000?

Mr. BARRON. \$30,000,000.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. At the time of the breaking out of this war negro men that were appraised at \$100, were worth from \$1,500 to \$2,000, and others in the same proportion. I say that it would be \$80,000,000 worth of property taken from the slaveholders of Maryland. I think I have shown that slavery in Maryland does not give material aid to the rebellion, that that argument is not applicable to us. But it is proposed to strike down this institution and without compensation. Now, where in the name of common sense do you get a precedent for this action? What justice is there in such a course? What right, under the law which governs all countries, have you to take my