

gentlemen so very different from remarks made by them on former occasions, that I am somewhat astonished for that reason. Now in regard to the gentleman from Worcester (Mr. Purnell,) I do not wish to answer his remarks for any other reason than this: I am afraid that if his remarks go unanswered to the people of the State, the impression might prevail that probably those of us who take a different view of this subject from what that gentleman does, were in favor of elevating the negro race; were in favor of something like negro equality; a rebash of that political, wishy-washy, meaningless talk which I think we met and effectually refuted in the canvass in this State. My only reason for noticing the remarks of the gentleman from Worcester is this: that he being known as a representative upon this floor of the Union party of the State, as it is called, and being opposed to us in this particular, if his remarks remain unanswered, the impression might prevail that those who opposed him did so for some such reason as that suggested; that is, we desired to elevate the negro race as compared with the white race; or rather, that we were in favor of this old idea of negro equality. For that reason, and that reason only, I wish to answer him.

And I wish to recall to the recollection of the gentleman some remarks made by him some time ago, which I heartily indorsed, and which when I did indorse them, I did not admit justified the idea that he or we were in favor of this policy of negro equality. I wish to recall to his recollection those remarks, because I indorsed them then, and indorse them now; and because I hold that in indorsing them now I do not indorse the idea of negro equality. The gentleman in his remarks on the article of the declaration of rights abolishing slavery, to be found on page 717 of the debates, said:

"I believe human nature is the same almost everywhere, and under almost any circumstances; although it may be covered with a black skin."

Mr. PURNELL. Read the connection.

Mr. PUGH. I will, for the connection is where the point is.

"It must be apparent to every man—though I speak more particularly to the farmer—who has employed slave labor and free labor, that free labor is incomparably more economical than slave labor."

Now the reason that justifies the latter clause of that quotation, is the same that justifies our course throughout this discussion, and our political course, as it is called, in the State. It is because we believe that free labor is a better system of labor than slave labor, that we are in favor of freeing the slaves of this State. It is not because we believe that when you free the slave you make him the equal of the white man. But it is simply for the reason suggested by the gen-

tleman, that "human nature is the same almost everywhere, and under almost any circumstances; although it may be covered with a black skin."

Again, the gentleman says, on page 719 of the debates:

"I have seen the free Africans in the military service of Brazil. For at the time I was there Don Pedro was at war with Rosas, of the Buenos Ayrean dominions, and every day the soldiers were paraded upon the public square for the review of the emperor; and in that long line of soldiers you would find the Portuguese, the Indian, the half-breed African, and the full-blooded African, all in the same uniform. There was but little distinction to be observed between them. All seemed to be working in the service of their great master; all seemed to perform their services with alacrity and willingness, without any control except the authority exercised over them all by those who have a right to direct them."

The point is that these conditions follow necessarily from the principle stated by the gentleman in the quotation I first read. That is, that "human nature being the same almost everywhere, even although covered by a black skin," it will be better developed in a free state than in a slave state.

Now that brings me right to the point of my objection to the adoption of the apprentice system in the State of Maryland. It is because I do not believe that is the course of policy to properly develop the nation. It is not the proper course of policy in order to make the labor of the State the most valuable. That is one reason only.

I might state here why I am opposed, as I am opposed, to all systems of apprenticeship. They are generally opposed to all laws, and are never admitted excepting under certain extraordinary circumstances. It is not the best condition of labor, to produce the best results to the nation. It is only recognized to be a system of labor to be appealed to as the very last resort, when there is no other way; when the party to be apprenticed is unable to take care of himself, or herself, or when there are no parents and they are orphans cast loose upon the world. Then that system of labor is resorted to. It is only adopted through the force of peculiar circumstances, and not as a wise measure in itself.

The gentleman from Worcester (Mr. Purnell) objected to the amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge)—after having made the remarks from which I have quoted, and which I heartily indorse—because it contemplated the education of this laboring class. Now I submit to him, and I do not think he will take issue with me upon that point, whether he does not recognize the fact that it is better to have educated labor than uneducated labor?