

for the observance of masters and slaves, if masters had no right to the services of the slave, or for the observance of the slave if he did not rightfully owe obedience to his master—they never teach us how to sin.

The bishop goes on with his authorities down to a late period, and gives various instances of their being held as property, and becoming inheritances to their children. But I will not trouble the Convention by reading further. Property, says the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Berry,) is an unrestricted right of use. In that sense a man cannot own his own house, because he cannot use that without restriction. He cannot set fire to it, when it will endanger his neighbor. It is a restricted use. There is no proposition you can assert, without some modification to it. Slave service is just as much due as property as any other kind of property. So far as the restriction is concerned, you cannot abuse your horse. If a man ill-treats his horse, he is subject to prosecution. But the slave is "his money."

One gentleman says that this article in the Constitution of the United States means apprentices; that if they ran away, their masters were entitled to their return. I would not deny that it included apprentices; but does any man doubt that it meant slaves? It has been the complaint of the abolitionists that the Constitution secured the slaves as the *property* of their masters. What are you going to do now? To make them no longer the property of their masters? Property in man? We are told by the gentleman from Talbot (Mr. Valliant,) and by the reverend gentleman from Caroline (Mr. Todd,) that it is wrong to hold property in man, that great changes have occurred since slavery was allowed. Sir, the great laws of morals never change. Truth is eternal. The very same truth which existed at the day to which reference has been made, in the first chapter of Genesis, when God created man—that which was true then, is true now. That which in principle was moral then, is moral now. Gentlemen have no ditch to dodge into to hide themselves from it. They have no entrenchments before them, to protect them against it. They must meet truth as it always was, morals as they always were, and as they always will continue to be. They must receive the account of Onesimus being sent back, as it was received by all antiquity, by every divine that ever wrote upon the subject, up to the period when this madness took possession of the brains of abolitionists. If any man can resist the evidence of such a case as that, where a sick apostle, an aged man, having a servant in his house, whose services he required, and whose services he had a right to command from his master, his master being under obligation to him, yet would not allow that servant to remain or to assume any other condition than to be sent home to become

subject again to his master. And why? Because without his authority he dared not receive him. If any man can resist the Bible evidence of such a case as this, that man's mind is not open to conviction.

Before proceeding further, I wish to allude here to the remarks of gentlemen with reference to their own emancipation upon this question; that they have *now* the privilege of expressing their sentiments; that they are *now* upon a platform on which they can stand and denounce at pleasure all who differ with them, and express in full all they think and feel upon this subject. Where did this talk come from? Was there ever a period in the State of Maryland when a free citizen dared not say he was opposed to slavery? It is a gross slander upon the law. Gentlemen do great injustice to the State. There never was a period, not only when they might not, but when there has not been a class of people among us who did not believe and openly declare the system of slavery an evil and a monstrosity, a system which ought not to be tolerated; and that these men can *now* for the first time express their views, is a delusion on their part.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to refer my friend to facts which occurred under his notice and judicial direction. In our county, where that gentleman was judge of our court—

The PRESIDENT. The Chair does not regard this as exactly a proper interruption, unless the gentleman yields the floor.

Mr. CHAMBERS. The Legislature very wisely, when we had slaves among us, prohibited excitement to insurrection; and I never heard the first person, even an abolitionist, say they did unwisely. It was offensive and criminal. It was the occasion of incarceration in the penitentiary to do so; and that law has been enforced. I was not aware that it had been enforced in my district, but certainly it was in Baltimore. And for a person of the North who had been sentenced to the penitentiary, I have seen in a Boston cemetery, a most splendid monument erected to his memory. This shows the different consideration the matter received there and here. Here he was put in the penitentiary; and there he had a monument erected to his memory.

They tell us, too, that *now* the people have this liberty as well as themselves. Are gentlemen aware what category they place themselves in, in assuming this proposition, that they are now for the first time able to tell us what they really think? What sort of language did they hold before? Were they insincere? We never heard in 1850, when that restriction was placed upon the legislation of this matter. These gentlemen say it has been their opinion; why not announce it? Have they not been in our midst holding language foreign to their real opinions? Have they been deceiving us, cheating us, defrauding us? I cannot think they have. I think bet-