

rallying around the Constitution as she has always done heretofore, then the policy of those who are in authority in this State, and out of this State, must be to preserve that Constitution intact. Destroy the portion of it that protects her citizens and their property and you will at once strike a blow from which, if she be not able to strike back, she will at least imbibe that spirit of hatred which is utterly incompatible with the successful administration of a republican government.

The object for which this Convention assembled was to frame a better organic law for the State than the one she at present has. I presume that there is no sane man who would desire to touch one article of it if it was presumed that we were to make a worse one. The object is to make a Constitution for the State of Maryland for all time to come, which will do full justice to all of its citizens. If so, I presume that there is no gentleman in this Convention who will for a moment assert that it is the duty of the members of this Convention to frame a Constitution which shall raise up, elevate, and benefit one class of citizens to the exclusion and detriment of another class. I suppose that there is no gentleman in this assembly who would advocate such a policy as would afford ample protection to one species of property, and entirely destroy another species of property. And more especially would I consider that no clear minded man would in his own conceit, in his own judgment, suppose he had a right to destroy a species of property which had stood the test of time for centuries past, which had had the support of all the best men throughout this continent, which had had the universal support of all the people in the State of Maryland; a species of property, the title to which runs back so far that there is no record evidence of the beginning of it.

I say, then, the object for which this Convention assembled is to make such a Constitution for the State of Maryland as will protect the interests of all the people of the State, and afford ample protection to all the interests of all the citizens of the State. With this preface I shall very briefly review some of the arguments which have been offered to show that the institution of slavery ought no longer to exist in this State.

The gentleman from Caroline county, (Mr. Todd,) and I believe the gentleman from Talbot, (Mr. Valliant,) said that the great argument—and they seemed to raise themselves up to the very height of the argument—that the great argument against the institution of slavery was its immorality. But they admitted also that although there was this great immorality, this crying sin attending the institution—although it was a great incubus upon the people of the State of Maryland—although it was that Upas tree which must be torn up by the roots, even though in

doing so you must have no regard to the interests of men, women, and innocent children—although it was of such enormity that it made him blush when he held up his head before white men—although it was an enormity of such magnitude that they even blushed in the face of the civilized world; notwithstanding they used all these epithets in regard to an institution which has existed from time immemorial in this State, they yet failed to cite one single authority from the Bible, from Genesis to Revelations, to show that the Saviour, or any great teacher therein mentioned, had ever been able to perceive the enormity of this evil. But they seemed to rely with peculiar emphasis upon the particular color of the people of my portion of the State, and of the Southern States generally, in support of their argument. They seemed to gloat over the idea that upon comparison the Northern States would appear to much greater advantage in this regard when compared with the South, when the relative population of mulattoes was taken into consideration. Upon that subject I would merely ask the gentleman to go to the statistics, as compiled by a man evidently sympathizing with the abolition of slavery. They will there find that the proportion of mulattoes at the North was more than double that of the South in the year 1860, and it is increasing at the same ratio up to this time for ought I know. As for my own county, I challenge any man to go through the length and breadth of that county, take any farm on it, and if he does not find there is more iniquity of that description in one single county in Pennsylvania or New York than he will find in the whole southern counties in this State, then I will give up the argument.

If the Bible does not say this institution of slavery is a sin, to what law or authority will gentlemen appeal? That great writer on ecclesiastical polity, Hooker, has said "the law has its origin in the breast of the Almighty, and its voice is the harmony of the world." Now, sir, if that law does not tell us that there is any sin in the institution of slavery, *per se*, if that law on the contrary clearly recognizes it as entirely compatible, with good morals, as the authorities which have been cited here on former occasions, authorities which may be found cited in this famous book of Bishop Hopkins, will abundantly testify—that slavery has been universally recognized by the Bible and throughout the world from the beginning of time; I ask again, if God's law does not make slavery sin, what law does? But if there is anything wanting in the book of Bishop Hopkins upon that subject, our own high dignitary in this State has said that slavery rests not only upon the feudal law, not only upon the civil law, not wholly upon the one or upon the other, but upon both—that its foundations are coeval and coextensive with the common