

for some crime I say that as a fact of history, not as a matter of law, there was a time when there were some slaves there.

Mr. CHAMBERS. And advertised for sale, and sold.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I presume so. If a person was sentenced to be a slave for crime, he was a slave and carried all the incidents of slavery with him.

But the question to which I was speaking was whether the people of Massachusetts sold their slaves to the South, put the money into their pockets, and then set up the cry of abolition. I say they did not do it.

Now, I am aware that we as Marylanders ought not to discuss this question for a reason that I will give presently. I say further, that certain places in the North were too largely engaged in the slave-trade. But Boston and Salem, Massachusetts, almost none at all; Rhode Island most disgracefully so; New York somewhat. Almost the only statistics I have ever been able to find upon the subject, relate to the last four years prior to 1808. By those statistics it appears that of the slaves brought to Charleston, South Carolina, something more than 7,000 were brought in Charleston owned vessels. Sixty-one vessels entered that port, engaged in that trade. One Boston owned vessel went there with 200 slaves. In that same time, when Boston sent one vessel to Charleston with 200 slaves, Baltimore sent four ships with 750 slaves. And for every slave that the whole North ever sold to the South, Maryland and Virginia have sold them by hundreds. Let us not talk about that then; it comes too near home. Who does not know that ever since we can remember, slavery has been unprofitable in both of those States? and we have been called both at home and abroad, not slave-holding States, but slave-producing States, as distinguished from the States farther South, which have been styled the slave-consuming States. Slavery has ceased to be profitable in States that have become grain-growing States. In other States cotton, rice and sugar have made it profitable; and in some cases tobacco can be profitably raised by slave labor. But the most profitable crops of tobacco, by all odds, raised in this country, are raised by free labor. But this is a digression, and I will return to the subject under consideration.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman's time has expired under the rule.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I hope the gentleman will have ample time to finish his speech, for I have listened to it with a great deal of pleasure. I move that his time be extended.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I thank the Convention very much for this courtesy. I, however, will not trespass upon their attention much longer. I had promised myself, and so stated to others, that I would confine my remarks within the hour.

A MEMBER. The gentleman has lost some time from interruptions.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I will avail myself of the courtesy extended to me to make one or two remarks in conclusion. I will not argue further the question of the material advantages of emancipation. I am satisfied that any one who will examine that question carefully will come to the same conclusion to which I have come. I have but one purpose in discussing this question; that is to find out what is right and just, and what is best for Maryland; I ask nothing else.

As I have said, we meet here with a common interest, and for a common purpose. I advocate the extinction of slavery because I believe before God that slavery is wrong. Upon that ground I stand. I believe also that honesty and right are the best policy. I believe that when we look at material wealth, at the means of national advancement, we shall come to the same conclusion; that the unpaid services of another man are not the means by which to build up either individual or national wealth and greatness.

But if it were otherwise, if it were a blessing instead of a curse, I have another reason why at this time I advocate the extinction of slavery, and that is, that though it were a blessing and a luxury, it is too costly. Look at the record of the last three years. Slavery is the cause of this war. I say that; and if time would permit I am ready to prove it. Look at the facts. What has rebelled? Gentlemen can remember, if they will look back to 1860, and it is a great while to go back, through such times as we have been passing through, crowded as they have been with tremendous incidents—yet, look back, and gentlemen will remember that almost before the ballots had done falling into the ballot-box, appeals were made to Maryland on all sides to take her stand with her "sister States of the South," and to raise up a standard of revolt against the decision of the ballot-box. And why? Because she had an institution in common with them. I think the first memorial of which I have any recollection was one to Governor Hicks, signed by Thomas G. Pratt, Sprigg Harwood and several others. That was followed by commissioners from Mississippi and from Alabama. Then there were meetings in Baltimore, and in the counties, and every one of them, for they are on record, appeal to this one ground of action on the part of Maryland; that she must link her fortunes with her "sisters of the South," because she had an institution in common with them.

Mr. CLARKE. I think I signed one of those memorials, and as well as I can remember—and I am positive of the fact—it did not put it upon the ground that Maryland should link her fortunes with her sister States of the South. But she should move with the view that she might preserve the Union, with all