

thousands of dollars' worth of other property which we have lost in the western portion of this State, and not a single word is said about the necessity of registering that property? In the county of Washington alone we have lost a million of dollars' worth of property by rebel invasion. If this species of property is to be registered with the hope of being able to come upon the federal government hereafter for payment, why not include the losses which western Maryland has sustained? It is rank injustice to specify one species of property and not include the other. If there is any action at all taken upon this subject, it should be wide enough and broad enough to include all species of property.

The people of my county have been assailed on the highway; their watches and pocket-books have been taken out of their pockets; their boots have been taken off their feet, and their hats off their heads. But that is not regarded as property. Nothing but the eternal negro seems to be property in this State. Now, we have not consumed the time of the convention in regard to the property we have lost, though we hope to be paid for it at some time. But everything is to be excluded from this convention but the eternal and infernal negro.

Mr. EDLEN. Does the gentleman, as a lawyer, see no distinction between the taking of property by the public enemy, and the State of Maryland, in her sovereign capacity, taking property from her own citizens?

Mr. NEOLEY. That question is not raised here. This section does not propose that the State shall pay anything for these slaves. It cannot be done, in face of what we have already provided in the forty-second section of this article, which forever prohibits the legislature of Maryland from passing any law with reference to remunerating slaveholders for their negroes.

Mr. CLARKE. I think it due to the gentleman who offered this proposition (Mr. Stockbridge,) to state that the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) offered an amendment to embody all the losses referred to in that section of the country, and I expressed my willingness to accept it, but the gentleman withdrew it. So far as this house had manifested any disposition upon the subject, there was no unwillingness to embodying that proposition in this section. But the gentleman withdrew it, and it was not put in.

Mr. NEOLEY. It is a question whether the State of Maryland is not bound to pay us in western Maryland also. Our allegiance is a double allegiance; we have a right to claim protection from the federal government, but we have a right to claim protection from the State government also; we have a right to claim protection from both, on account of the allegiance that we owe and yield to both. And it is a question whether primarily, and

in the beginning, the State of Maryland is not bound to us in western Maryland, because the State has failed to protect us.

Now, sir, in case of an invasion, it is the duty of the State of Maryland to protect itself as far as it can by its own military power. If that fails, then it falls back upon the federal government, and asks its assistance to protect it. And it is a question whether we are not necessitated to take this same course in seeking remuneration for losses for want of protection. I think, that in point of justice and of law, we of western Maryland, have just as much right to call upon this State for remuneration for our losses, as the slaveholders have for their negroes.

The people of Maryland are just as innocent of the decreased value of negro property, as they are innocent of the invasions which have robbed us of our property. It is from outside influences, over which, we as a State, and as a people, have had no control, that negro property has been rendered utterly valueless. And, therefore, upon the theory that there is no value in the property, there is no legal or moral claim for compensation.

I hope this section will be reconsidered; and that if anything at all upon the subject is to go into the constitution, it will embrace all species of property that have been lost by the want of proper protection on the part of the federal or State governments.

Mr. EDLEN. This proposition of compensation from the general government, was on a former occasion brought before this convention by the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke.) And my friend from Howard (Mr. Sands,) when his name was called, took occasion, as he frequently does, to explain his vote. And I find on page 303 of the journal of debates, that he used this language on that occasion:

"When I was a candidate before the people, I pledged myself publicly in printed cards, if I came here, to serve them in a certain way. I said I was for the convention and for emancipation; I was opposed to State compensation, but I would do all that could be done in an honorable way, to obtain from the general government, compensation for those entitled to it. A man who pledges himself, and betrays the people when he gets here, in my opinion, is not worthy of a seat. I am not opposed to the principle of the resolution, and am bound in honor to join in the effort; but I think it is premature, and therefore vote to table it."

Now, my learned friend has placed himself in this position; he has recorded himself upon this journal of debates, as saying that he will use every honorable means to obtain compensation from the general government. Now, I put to him the question, whether the means pointed out by the section of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge) be the converse of that means set out by him