

of hearing one of her sons—now representing her in one branch of Congress—announce in the great commercial city of the Empire State, that the Constitution organized a national consolidated Government, and with a view of more firmly establishing such a consolidated Government in the midst of this sad struggle, which the Crittenden resolution declared should be waged, not for purposes of subjugation or to destroy the States or their institutions, but only to assert the authority of the Federal Government over the States in rebellion, it is proposed to bring the action of Congress to bear directly upon the States in rebellion, the essential feature of which proposition is that Congress shall assume jurisdiction over them. The “pestilent pretension of States’ rights” is to be thus summarily disposed of, and, under the theory of “State suicide,” or “State forfeiture,” or “State abdication”—followed by the denial of “State rights, immortal and unimpeachable”—our structure of government is sought to be merged in one “consolidated head,” over which, under the plea of freedom to the African slave or the “abolition of slavery in the States through the war,” ending in slavery to the white man—and I understand that the Cleveland Convention has announced that it is now time to maintain the freedom of the white man—the goddess of “*amalgamation, equality and fraternity*” shall reign triumphant in orgies more wild, and scenes more terrible, than darkened the soil of France amid the days of the reign of terror. Why, I ask the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Stirling,) thus make the conservative old State of Maryland, to which he is to the manor born as well as myself, and whom I had the privilege in early days when we were starting out in our profession, and were in the same debating society to hear then announce doctrines as consistent with the proper structure and formation of the government as I think I now hold; for I stand where I started, and where we stood then when we battled for the same good principles—

Mr. STIRLING. With the permission of the gentleman, I will say that we were both whigs then, and he has now separated from me.

Mr. CLARKE. I never was a whig in my life. The first vote I ever cast for a President, was for James Buchanan in 1856—Whiggery ended with Scott in 1852; and I happened then to be studying law somewhere, and I had not then commenced my political career. But the gentleman has arisen in political life upon the new issues which succeeded dead whiggery. I would ask the gentleman why should the State of Maryland, when down in old St. Mary’s was first raised, amid those American wilds, the banner of civil and religious liberty—why make the State of Maryland lead the van in the onward

march to consolidated empire? If this proposition had been introduced here by some new importation into the State, I might not have been surprised at it. I might have expected it. But it comes, and oh! that is the saddest part of it, that it comes from a son of Maryland to the manor born. Why in this day thus tarnish the fair fame of our State? Mute and silent she has been. No sovereign Convention uttered for her people, words of conciliation and entreaty to stay the impending disruption of the government. And I desire here to make a short digression. When it was asked the other day by the gentleman from Howard, (Mr. Sands) who saved Maryland, whether it was not Governor Hicks? I answered, that whatever might be the opinions of the gentleman from Howard, I thought that Governor Hicks did not save Maryland.

Mr. SANDS. The gentleman is mistaken; I never said so.

Mr. CLARKE. Governor Hicks did not save Maryland?

Mr. SANDS. I said he did not save Maryland. I said that the people saved Maryland: and so they did.

Mr. CLARKE. Well, sir, I will say this: that if the people of Maryland had had at that time a proper executive officer at the head of the government of the State of Maryland, the people of Maryland would not only have saved the State of Maryland, but, acting through a proper executive officer, in my humble judgment, would have saved the Union. It is my candid conviction, uttered here to-day in the sight of high heaven, that there was not in the State of Maryland at that time, any desire to break up this Union. We desired to cling to the Constitution of the United States; we desired to save the country from the impending war. And when the gentlemen from the South came on here and requested the co operation of the State of Maryland—not for the purpose of getting out of the Union—but with the view of preserving the rights of all the States—they announced that if the South would only stand up to the doctrine of co-operation and maintain their rights, we would have no war, no disunion, but the government would be preserved intact.

Mr. SANDS. In consideration of the good name and fair fame of a man of now world-wide reputation, which is now at stake, I will tell the gentleman if he will permit me, what Governor Hicks told me the day before the outbreak in Baltimore, was the mission of those southern gentlemen.

Mr. CLARKE. I know what it was. As I am only expressing my individual opinion, the gentleman can reply to me when I am through. If the Governor of this State had said then to those men—the State of Maryland shall not secede, we will not go with you in that; but we have rights and will co-operate with you to maintain those rights—