

I, for one, Mr. President, am unwilling thus to make the debt of the State of Maryland amount to almost \$85,000,000. I believe when we receive the information already asked for by an order of this Convention, from the Treasurer, it will be found that the debt of the State would exceed this sum if she assumes to compensate for the slaves liberated by this article.

This debt added to our present heavy taxation, Federal and county, would impose a burden upon this and coming generations which I should shudder to require them to pay, and from which their only escape would be *repudiation*. In fact the *landed* interest of the State will, in a short time have the larger portion to pay, and the slaveholder, with his large real estate, will find in the end he had only taken from one pocket to pay into the other. But what follows from this? That the *State should emancipate without compensation?* By no means. I have already endeavored to show that the State had no right to destroy this property without compensation, and that such action would also be unconstitutional. It therefore results from the fact that she *cannot compensate*, that she should *not Emancipate*, and that the *status* of slavery should remain *unchanged*, unless she can receive from some other sources full and fair compensation for the property of her citizens.

And this brings me, Mr. President, to the plan proposed in the amendment which I had the honor to offer, and which was to-day withdrawn. I shall only base my argument upon it. I shall not, Mr. President, bring the Convention to a vote upon it. The fact that a proposition comes from this side of the House, independent of all consideration of its merits, seems sufficient to consign it to defeat. I shall now merely read it, and leave it to go on the journal, to be dealt with hereafter, before this Convention adjourns, as a majority of this body may deem due to the cause of justice, and the protection of the people of the State. It is in these words:

Amend article 28d by striking out all after the word "that," in line 1st, and insert:

"From and after the first day of January, 1865, there shall in this State be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except in punishment of crime, wherof the party shall have been duly convicted, and all persons held to service or labor as slaves are hereby declared free, from and after the

first day of January, 1865, provided the Congress of the United States shall, before the 1st day of January, 1865, make an appropriation to the State of Maryland, of not less than twenty millions of dollars, to aid the State of Maryland in providing compensation to the owners of slave property, and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall certify to the Governor of this State that the said sum of money is subject to the draft of the Treasurer of the State of Maryland, to be disposed of by the Legislature of the State, to pay the owners of slaves for their slaves hereby declared free; and provided further, that unless Congress shall make the said appropriation as hereinbefore provided, this section shall be null and void, and it is hereby declared that it shall be of no effect whatever."

This is the only mode, which, in my opinion, can be adopted to carry out the scheme of emancipation in a just manner, and which thereby avoids the commission of the wrongs I have referred to—both legal, constitutional, and moral. It is, what may be termed emancipation *conditioned* upon an appropriation being made by the Federal Government to the State to *aid*, and to *enable* her to compensate her citizens for property taken from them. Is it not right that the Government which is really and directly benefited should pay an equivalent? Is not the abolition of slavery in Maryland chiefly urged upon the theory that it will advance the national cause, and tend to an almost illimitable extent to the suppression of the rebellion? Suppose the Government says, to suppress this rebellion; I must have all the horses in Pennsylvania, New York and Massachusetts—Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore must strip themselves of their supplies of bacon, flour, medicines, hay, corn, &c., and forthwith place them at the disposal of the Government. Or suppose the edict should go forth, that as the manufacturers of Massachusetts have made all their wealth from cotton, the product of slave labor, (and therefore founded on wrong as gentlemen argue here,) the magnificent factories must be razed to the ground, the stocks of goods must be delivered up or thrown out gratuitously to the public, and the wealth thus accumulated must be subdivided for the general good among the poorer classes of the citizens. Suppose the same argument should be urged there, as is urged here by supporters of this emancipation policy,