

From the above it will be seen that the aggregate value of the slave property of this State, in 1859-60, was thirty-five millions three hundred and thirty-one thousand one hundred and eleven dollars.

Why in this period of heavy taxation, and when men require all the labor it is possible to secure, do we find the majority of this Convention thus clamoring to destroy property worth to her citizens forty millions of dollars?

I have shown already the terms in which only a few years ago some of the now warmest advocates of emancipation spoke of the project. Emancipation results not from the free and willing choice of the people of the State, or even from the natural instincts and convictions of its friends. To be an emancipationist is now the high-road to political fame, rewards, and lucrative contracts. The more *radical* the plan and principles announced, the more surely does their advocate gain favor with the "powers that be." The action of the Federal Government has destroyed the *value* of slave property, as the gentleman from Talbot (Mr. Valliant,) says, and hence among other reasons his willingness to abolish it. I feel satisfied that if to-morrow the market value of the negro was restored, and Maryland was left to act freely upon this question, as she was before military power was exerted, and the tempting offers of Federal patronage were extended, that the maintenance of the institution would now be as firmly and *unanimously* advocated as ever.

What is the real, unvarnished statement of the cause of emancipation in Maryland?

Upon the election, Mr. President, of Abraham Lincoln, the administration and patronage of the Government passed into the hands of an *anti-slavery* party. The seat of Government—the capital of the United States—is located on the confines of Maryland, and it has become a policy dear to the Administration and the northern people—a policy of *paramount importance*—to carry out the scheme of emancipation in Maryland. It is a policy of *paramount* importance because—

1st. On the hypothesis of a reconstructed Union, it will be either impossible then to abolish slavery in the State, or only after the elapse of time. And if it is done now, it is important to do it in such a manner as will carry a moral force with it.

2d. On the hypothesis of the continued prosecution of the war it will sunder, in the belief of the Administration, the last tie

which unites Maryland with the Southern States.

3d. On the hypothesis of *peace* upon terms of treaty stipulation, it will secure the State to the north, simplify questions of boundary, and avoid all complications growing out of an attempt to settle the limits of the two confederacies, which would exist in the event that Maryland remains slaveholding.

I ask again, how can slavery be abolished in Maryland on a basis just to all interests?

I do not deny the power of the General Government by the military arm, in the sense of *might*, to remove, entice, or force from the State of Maryland, and so place beyond the temporary control of their masters, the slaves now in Maryland. It has been done already to a great extent. But that does not destroy the *legal* status of slavery, or abolish slavery in the State *de jure*. This war cannot last forever. When peace is restored the rights of the master would revive. Maryland without a slave in the State at the end of the war, although not slaveholding *de facto*, would be so *de jure*. And within a short time, so soon as the authority of the owner could be re-instated, by tracing out and reclaiming his slave, the State would be both *de jure* and *de facto* slaveholding as before the war. The mere taking away of the slaves does not accomplish the object of the Administration. It carries no moral force with it. It is not the success of a policy.

Further, Mr. President, the State of Maryland is not in *rebellion* against the Government of the United States. She is therefore entitled to all her rights under the Constitution of the United States. It is conceded in the President's message of last December, that the General Government has no right to interfere with the institution in the States not in rebellion. "Such a proposition," he says, speaking of the resolution pledging compensation by Congress, in his Message of March 6th, 1862, "on the part of the Federal Government, sets up no claim of right by Federal authority to interfere with slavery within the State limits, referring as it does the absolute control of the subject in each case to the State and its people immediately."

There is no ground for the General Government to found a right to abolish slavery in Maryland on the plea of the preservation of the government, or on the plea of *military* necessity, further than a *special* military necessity to take the able-bodied men,