

sation frequently had control of all his master's goods, (Gen. 24: 10,) and, in default of children, became his nominated heir, (Gen. 15: 3, and Prov. 17: 2,) and says, in a foot note, "Our Saviour alludes to this in the parable of the wicked servants, who slew the son—the only heir—the inheritance might be theirs." And Mr. Cobb's argument is conclusive.

In addition to all this, it is admitted on all hands that all Hebrew slaves went out free, at the year of jubilee. This virtually carries with it the admission that the slaves bought of the stranger went out free also. For it will be remembered, that the Jewish law required the naturalization—the circumcision of such slaves. This circumcision, which was a covenant sign and seal, brought them into the condition of adopted Hebrews, and entitled them to all the rights, privileges and immunities of the covenant of grace, sworn to and attested by the Almighty to Abraham. In reference to the difficulty presented in the declaration that these strangers were to serve their masters forever, it has been claimed by eminent authority, that this term had reference to the end of the period closed by the inauguration of the year of jubilee, just as the phrase—"end of the world"—in some places in the New Testament manifestly referred to the end of the Jewish dispensation, ("and now, once, in the end of the world, hath Christ appeared to put away sin, &c.,") and that it is used to distinguish the period of their service from that of Hebrew servants who might, in certain cases, become free before the above specified period.

I give that for what it is worth and no more. It must be acknowledged that it has some plausibility, though it is not conclusive, I confess.

But suppose, Mr. President, absolute slavery existed under the Jewish dispensation, does this prove the divine right of the American system? If it does, then reasoning upon the same principle, I claim the divine right of Brigham Young to have forty wives, or as many as suits his convenience, up to at least 1,000; for Abraham and Jacob had each two, David had several, and Solomon 700 wives and 300 concubines, making the round number of 1,000!

But, says the objector, and now I come to my friend from Prince George's (Mr. Berry,) "slavery is recognized as a divine right in the New Testament." Where? "Why, in the regulations given for the government of the relations of master and servant," and in the further fact that Paul sent Onesimus back to his master Philemon. In answer to this I have to say, that Christ and his followers set us a proper example of recognizing civil authority and enactments so long as the statute existed, an example which had it been followed by those on whose behalf gentlemen on the other side plead, would have saved the

world and heaven the sad spectacle our country this day presents. That they not only made no *open, violent* attack on *slavery*, but that they passed over in comparative silence other relics of barbarism legalized by the laws of the Roman empire. But they thus acted, trusting and knowing that the principles inculcated in the religion which they promulgated would, through their silent but powerful influence, work the cure for all the moral, social and political ills to which society is subject.

As an evidence of the correctness of this position, sir, I refer to the historical fact that no sooner had Christianity spread its blessed influences over the Roman empire, at about the close of the third century of its existence, than slavery was swept from the land. This fact in the history of slavery, in connection with the early history of our religion, shows most conclusively that slavery is at variance with the pure influences of an Apostolic Christianity; and that when these principles and influences have free course allowed them, they will inevitably operate to the destruction of slavery.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. Did not St. Paul instruct the slave to be obedient to his master?

Mr. TODD. I will come to that presently.

Why, sir, in our land, in the South especially, Christianity has never been allowed the exercise of its full power. The utmost a minister has dared to do has been to inculcate the duty of masters to be humane to their servants, and it depended upon whether he was born on Southern soil if he were permitted to venture even thus far.

I am standing here to-day and uttering sentiments which I have not dared to utter—I confess it with shame—as a minister of the Gospel I have not dared to utter them in any community where I have resided. I have not dared to do it for the simple reason that I believed my life would have paid the forfeit, or if I had escaped with my life, I would have been compelled to leave the community.

The *pulpit*, *Christian organizations*, the *press*, every arm of Christian power has been sedulously watched; nothing has been free to call in question the *divine right* of slavery. Our church disciplines, religious papers, and even the sacred ballads and hymns we have been wont to sing around our firesides and in our religious gatherings, have been declared incendiary, and interdicted by legal enactment. The whole, broad scowling frown of society, rested with all its weight and blackness upon an individual or Christian society that dared intimate that emancipation might be desirable; and, Mr. President, I once knew a large part of a minister's congregation to get up and leave the church, because he had the misfortune and the bad taste to announce and read the hymn of jubilee, commencing—"Blow ye the trumpet, blow," &c.