

business has intervened since the motion to adjourn was last voted upon.

The PRESIDENT. The motion to adjourn is not now in order. Some intervening business must be transacted before the motion to adjourn can be renewed.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset, resumed: I admit to the fullest extent the power of the government over property. I admit that the State of Maryland has the right to say to her citizens what objects they shall hold as property, and provide guarantees for its protection, and remedies for all injury to it. But I do say that when the State of Maryland has thus announced to its citizens what is property, and what shall be protected by all the courts and other authorities of the State as property, then the public faith becomes pledged to those who have invested the proceeds of their labor in that property, that they shall not be deprived of it suddenly and without compensation. I put it upon the ground of that good faith which the State should observe towards her citizens.

Now in regard to the provision which should be made for the support of the aged and infirm. Gentlemen here can have very little idea about this species of property; they can form but little conception of the number of them. These people live to a very great age. I have known some of them well on to a hundred years old. They become helpless, sometimes in their second childhood, and require to be nursed and taken care of. Many of the others are idiotic, and require to be taken care of as children, even after arriving at years of maturity. And what is to be done with all these 80,000 negroes you are to set free? Or suppose there are 75,000 of them remaining; the federal government has taken some 5,000 or 6,000 of them into its service. But with their natural increase, I suppose there are not many less than 80,000 now in the hands of their owners, for there has been no exportation from the State for the last three years. Heretofore, there has been an exportation from the State, of not less than several millions of dollars in value every year. For many years, before 1861, I think the exportation from Somerset county alone, was at least from \$100,000 to \$150,000 in value each year. Some owners emigrated and carried their slaves with them farther South, where they were of more value. And I know persons who have, within the last three years, under the sanction of the State, invested from \$3,000 to \$3,500 in this property, at from \$1,000 to \$1,200 each.

Now, as to those that are under age, minors; what is to become of those from a few weeks old, those that are not yet born, but will be born between this time and the adoption of the constitution? They are to be set free in their mother's arms, and with the best she could do, she could not do much

more than feed and clothe herself; and I have known some who could not do that. I have seen, in our court, a negro woman from twenty-five to thirty years of age, come in, and under your law apply to the judge to be allowed to indebted herself into slavery to a person who would undertake to feed and clothe her. I have heard the judge say to her: "Do you understand the consequences of the act you are about to perform? That you and your children will be slaves forever? that the law of the State provides that if you consent now to become the slave of this man, you and your children become slaves forever to him?" And he has told her to take time and reflect upon the matter; and has allowed her three months. And at the next term, she came back again and renewed the application, saying she had no home, and could get no employment. That was not more than four years ago, I am certain. She had no friends to go to, and would rather be the slave of the humane man she had selected for her master, where she would have a home.

What is to be done with reference to children from a few days or weeks old, up to ten or twelve years of age? I suppose those who are ten or twelve years of age, may find those who would be glad to take them and support them, if they are healthy, and have common sense, and can be made good servants of. They have been reared to that age at the expense of their owners, or if they did not rear them they purchased them. If they reared them to ten or twelve years of age, it has been at the expense of from \$300 to \$400 each. From the time they were born, their doctor's bills, their food and clothing will cost that much. Now, who is to compensate their owners for rearing them to that age? Suppose they are set free; the orphans' court under your laws are to dispose of them. They may select their former owners, if they choose. The owners may apply, and Tom, Dick and Harry may apply for them. The owner will say: "I have been to an expense of \$300 or \$400 to rear this child to this age, and I think I ought to have his services until he is of age." The court may reply—"That may be so, but we have discretion in the matter;" and they may bind him to some one who has not, upon the express pledge of the State, been at the expense of rearing him. This question addresses itself to the sense of humanity, as well as the sense of justice of this convention.

I had desired to say a word or two to my worthy friend from Howard (Mr. Sands) upon his most unfortunate illustration from Scripture. While the gentleman may be well read in the law, I would suggest that he better leave the prophets to my friend from Caroline (Mr. Todd.) Why, sir, he had the whole children of Israel except Joseph sold into slavery in Egypt, when the truth was