demnation of the evil. ' And at one of her late assemblies this very forcible language was used:

"In view, therefore, of its former testimo-nies upon the subject, the General Assembly does hereby devoutly express its gratitude to Almighty God for the great deliverance he has prepared for our country from the evil and guilt of slavery; its cordial approbation of the measures taken by the National and State authorities for its extirpation as the root of bitterness from which has sprung rebellion, war and bloodshed, and the long list of hor-rors that follow in their train; this prolific source of evil and harm will be speedily followed by the blessings of our Heavenly Father, the return of peace, union and fraternity and abounding prosperity to the whole land; and recommend to all in our communion to labor honestly, earnestly and unweariedly in their respective spheres for this glorious consummation, to which human justice, Christian love, national peace and prosperity, every earthly and every religious interest combine to pledge them."

Similar views have been and are entertained by the Baptists, Lutherans, New School Presbyterians, and almost every other Christian denomination, as I now recollect. The Catholic church from a remote period has borne its unqualified testimony against; whilst the Quakers, or Friends, have been more consistent than they all, in having first rid themselves of the evil, and then in their bold, outspoken and continued hostility thereto, even from the time of Fox. It is true that the Episcopal church, as a church, has held rather aloof from the subject until within a few years past. But now she too has come up boldly and taken her stand side by side with her sister churches. I hold in my hand the indignant protest of a large number of the clergy of Pennsylvania to the defence of slavery as a divine institution by Bishop Hopkins.

Mr. Chambers. Only seventy.

Mr. Daniel. That is a very fair number for one State.

It is in these words:

"The subscribers deeply regretting the fact of the extensive circulation through this diocese of a letter by John Henry Hopkins, of the Diocese of Vermont, in defence of Southern slavery, compels them to make this public protest. It is not their province to mix in any political canvass. But as ministers of Christ, in the Protestant Episcopal Church, it becomes them to deny complicity or sympathy with such defence.

"This attempt, not only to apologize for slavery in the abstract, but to advocate it as it exists in the cotton States, and in the States which sell men and women in the open market as their staple product, is, in their judgment, unworthy of any servant of Jesus Christ. As an effort to sustain, on Bible principles, the States in rebellion against the government, in the wicked attempt to establish by force of arms a tyranny under the name of republic, whose 'corner-stone' shall be the perpetual bondage of the African, it challenges their indignant reprobation."

This document is headed by Alonzo Potter,

D. D., LL. D., the Bishop of that State.
I know the Southern clergy have appealed to Europe in behalf of this institution as a divine one, and to enlist their sympathies, but so far from finding any real sympathy on that side of the water, a communication therefrom couched in the strongest language of rebrobation, and signed by 4,000 English and French clergymen, was sent to this country by representatives of their own body, expressing their entire sympathy with the government in this struggle. What else could we expect from the land of John Wesley, of Clarkson and Wilberforce?

There is, however, one system of slavery we read of in the Bible having many features in common with American slavery. I mean the enslavement of the Hebrews by Pharoah. It was similar in its origin, having been commenced by the surreptitious taking of Joseph by his brethren and selling him into a foreign land. The labor was also alike oppressive and unrequited. There is also a strong resemblance in the wonderful increase of slaves in the slave States, above their brethren in the free States, and the wonderful increase of these Israelites under their Egyptian bondage. So great was it in the latter case, that Pharoah became so much alarmed that he ordered all the males among them to be slain. There are also other points of similarity. And as God heard their cries and groans and prayers, and in due time brought them out, in his wrath, with "a high hand and an outstretched arm," so I believe He is about to deliver this people of the African race, who for these long many years have been crying to Him by day and by night, and to purify this nation, even though it may require years more of this frightful sacrifice of blood and treasure.

The opinions of the founders of the Republic were alike averse to the institution of slavery. Jefferson says in reference to the slave-trade-

"The abolition of domestic slavery is the great object of desire in those colonies, where it was, unhappily, introduced in their infant state. But previous to the enfranchisement of the slaves we have, it is necessary to exclude all further importations from Africa. Yet our repeated attempts to effect this by prohibitions, by imposing duties which might amount to a prohibition, have been hitherto defeated by his Majesty's negative; thus preferring the immediate advantage of a few British corsairs to the lasting interest of the American States, and to the rights of human nature, deeply wounded by this infamous practice."—Jefferson's Works, vol. 1, p. 135.