

has travelled much and his new born delivered. At some other time, he, [Mr. B.] might take part in the discussion.

Mr. MERRICK rose, at a very late hour, and said a very few words on the necessity which existed for a vigilant supervision of the finances of the State, which would go to ruin, if that vigilance was relaxed. The people ought, therefore, to be annually convened by their legislature, for that purpose.

A committee might be partial, and its report would not give the people that security which would be obtained by the presence of the legislature. Instead of extending the biennial sessions to ninety or one hundred and twenty days it would be better to have annual sessions of half that length.

The amendment of the gentleman from Queen Anne's, (Mr. Spencer,) would enable the legislature to return to biennial sessions, at any time when the public interests may require more prompt legislation.

Mr. THOMAS made a brief reply, in which he argued against giving the power to the legislature, to return to biennial sessions on one hand, while we were restricting them on the other. It was said the legislature might adjourn to meet the next year, to take up the unfinished business. In that case there would be few votes against it.

His colleague, (Mr. Biser,) had travelled his county oftener than he, [Mr. T.,] would, to be President of the United States; but it was a pregnant fact, that he was never in a single instance, called to account for his vote in favor of biennial sessions.

And then the Convention adjourned until tomorrow, at eleven o'clock.

*Sketch of the Remarks of Mr. BLAKISTONE, on Wednesday, Feb. 5, on the motion of Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore, to amend the twenty-first article of the Bill of Rights, in relation to the "free colored population."*

Mr. BLAKISTONE said it was wondrous strange that such a proposition should receive any countenance in a Convention of the State of Maryland. These people are among us, and was it possible that any one here could desire to put them out of the pale of our protection. In this nineteenth century was such a doctrine to be set forth in such an assembly.

Mr. B. read the article as it now stands, and then came the amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore. If ever there was a proposition of doubtful propriety it was that now offered. We have had much talking here about human rights, and the rights of the people. He yielded to no man in his advocacy of the rights of the people, and perhaps he went farther than any member of the Convention for extending them. The free colored population have no political rights here, and never can have any. These people have been placed by the Providence of God among us, and he was 'or giving them protection. Insert this amendment and they will be thrown at the mercy of the wicked, even of the kidnaper,

who will come and steal them in the midst of us; and here you offer him a license to do so, because, when you say certain rights of certain persons shall be protected, you leave all other persons and all other rights, not specifically enumerated, unprotected, and open to violation. *Inclusio unius est exclusio alterius.* The amendment goes even beyond this, and specified their exclusion from the protection the original article was designed to afford. It was the duty of every Marylander to repudiate the doctrine of this amendment. The moment a human being, native, or foreigner, white or black, bond or free, sets his foot upon our soil, he is under the protection of the laws of the State, and when that time shall come when you take away that protection, which he trusted never would, violence and outrage would stalk with unbridled plurensy throughout the land. Looking at it in a political aspect he referred to the efforts which had recently been made to effect a dissolution of the Union. He had no sympathies with disunionists in any quarter, north or south, east or west. He was for the Union as it is, one and indivisible.

He asked the gentleman from Baltimore, if he was willing to pander to this morbid excitement, to this turbulent and unholy spirit? Was he willing to add fuel to the flame of discord, that prevails in our land? Was he willing to give even the semblance of an argument to the northern abolitionists—the professed friends, but the worst enemies of the colored race, against one of the slave holding States of this Union. He could not give his consent to insert a provision saying, that the free colored population should not be protected in their persons and property. He believed the slave holding States of this Union, the best friends of the colored race. In case of necessity, he would be willing to colonize them among their own race in Liberia. There they would have rights which will not be given to them here.

But, this Convention ought to be careful not to fan the flame which a discontented portion of the Union has endeavored to kindle. Let the colored people know that they will find protection here. Let them understand that they are better protected, and better cared for in Maryland than they are in any other State of the Union. Many of them know this already, although there may be some too stupid to understand their own best interests. They, the more stand in need of our protection. There may be some bad among them, as well as some good, but whether they were all good or all bad, they are equally entitled to protection while they remain here. If they disturb the peace of the State, they should be removed, and the legislature has the power to remove them, as the penalty for their misconduct.

But if we cannot get rid of them, while they are here, let the broad mantle of protection be extended over them. He could not see what good could result from this amendment, its only tendency, in his opinion, was to feed the prevailing excitement. If it was ever thought proper to get rid of this class, (these people of color,) in