

the time when this inimical action towards slavery was commenced in Maryland. Was it not then worth forty millions, and have not the slaveholders in the injuries resulting to them from the loss of labor and loss of crops by reason of the employment or abstraction of their negroes by the Federal Government, and which are to be computed in fixing the damages, suffered a further loss of nearly twenty millions of dollars? My demand, therefore, is a moderate one. If I estimate it according to the rules which would govern in giving legal advice to a client, or in asking instructions from the Court, or in argument before a jury, I should fix it at not less than sixty millions. Aye, sir, in a like case, in which one man's rights were involved in a controversy with another, I should claim that the injured party was entitled to *exemplary* and *consequential* damages.

Give us, Mr. President, the twenty millions and I should regard it as a mere compromise. If the slaveholders accepted it they would do it as a mere compromise. They would not be *bribed* thereby, nor would they be sudden converts, men who have changed the ideas of a lifetime. No, sir, I hope they will never change their views or principles, and thereby dishonor their name, their parentage, their fame, and their native State. But seeing the Government is determined by its policy to take away all the negroes, they *might contract*, they might *accept*, they might *sell out* their rights of property upon the same principle which actuates men who, having a legal controversy, can agree upon terms of *final* settlement without a waiver or sacrifice of their principles.

There are two other points connected with this subject, Mr. President, which I must briefly allude to before concluding, as they have been heralded over the State through the press and on the hustings as conclusive against this claim of the slaveholders.

When the slaveholder claims compensation, somewhat approximating a low value of his property, some wiseacre replies, "Look at your assessment books. You have been either cheating the State for years, or you are attempting to drive a hard bargain as we Yankees have the credit of doing whenever we can." I accept neither horn of the dilemma. Slaves were assessed in 1852, shortly after the settlement of the national troubles of 1850, and before the price of this property recov-

ered from the depreciation which had taken place in it. The votes on the passage of the bill in the General Assembly show that the representatives from different sections of the State regarded the valuation to be a fair assessment. There was no proposition to amend the valuation—in fact, the valuation approximated more nearly their market value than other kinds of property. Where do you find real estate assessed at its full value? In my own county land worth \$80 per acre, pays taxes at the rate of \$40 per acre. Some real estate in Baltimore city, or in the county, will be found assessed at not one-fifth of its present market price. And pray, sir, who goes to the assessment books to ascertain the value of property, or introduces them as evidence of title? The slaveowner is not the only one, therefore, who, tried by this standard, is cheating the State, or if his property is about to be taken, in claiming damages, will drive a hard bargain, if he demands more than its assessed value.

Another politician of this school, which thinks it all right to take away the property of the citizen and not pay for it, thus screens the injustice of the act. The member who represents the 3d Congressional District will tell you, "it is too late to demand compensation—the State has already rejected the proposition." Mr. President, I deny it. I demand the time, place and occasion. Who are the *parties to the contract*? The United States Government and the people of the State assembled in Convention. They are the contracting parties. When before this have the people of the State been assembled in Convention? No other power in the State could act on the subject. Does Mr. Crisfield's action—his motion to lay an imperfect bill upon the table of the House of Representatives conclude the State? This is the first time I ever heard that Mr. Crisfield constituted the State of Maryland. Did he represent the *State* and speak for her as a *State*? Was he not a member of Congress for the 1st Congressional District of Maryland, and as such did he not partly represent the United States Government as one of the contracting parties and not the State.

The National Intelligencer of May 14th, 1864, in an editorial entitled the "truth of recent history vindicated," powerfully combats the doctrine that the border States have ever declined the proposition of emancipation with compensation, and says, "we hold it is not just to say that the border