

Mr. CLARKE. With Governor Hicks' permission.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman must not interrupt the speaker in this manner.

Mr. CUSHING. Without Governor Hicks' permission. I never have thought, nor do I now think, that Governor Hicks acted up to the full measure of his duty at that time. But while I think he failed essentially in that strong manliness that should have led him to have stood up boldly against men who were then attempting the controversy and the subversion of the laws and the supremacy of the United States, still I believe that but for the partial resistance of the Governor, they would have succeeded, and gladly succeeded, in sweeping our State into the vortex of secession. Their failure to do this, I do hold, was due to the partial resistance of Governor Hicks, aided by the knowledge that hundreds and thousands at the North had arisen at the first shot fired at Fort Sumter, teaching us that we dare not put ourselves in the way of such an avalanche. And when a few days after the outbreak at Baltimore, when the people came to decide upon the members to be sent to the State Legislature, then about to assemble, the vote of the minority in that election was so terribly potent, and revealed within that community so strong an opposition to the views that those representatives entertained, that per force they had to pause.

Now, if we had had a Governor of the principles entertained by a certain ex-Governor, who professed to be the exponent of the opinions of the democratic party—I refer to Enoch Louis Lowe—I would ask the gentleman if he thinks that, with that man in the gubernatorial chair, Maryland to-day would have been in the Union? And does not the gentleman believe that, had that individual been in the executive chair of this State, the flood of civil war would have swept over the plains of Maryland? He would have been a proper Governor to contrast with Governor Hicks, as a man representing diametrically opposite views upon the fundamental question of the supremacy of the Federal Government—which is the question at issue before this Convention. I say that Enoch Louis Lowe would have been the proper representative of principles opposite to those maintained by Governor Hicks; and I cite those two men as representatives of opposite views, the one in contra-distinction to the other. And I ask gentlemen—who with me lived in a portion of this community when a man dared not, in the streets of the city where he lived, say that he stood up for the Union of the United States, because he would be mobbed; when, for the same reason, he dare not visit the graves of his fathers and say, "I hold to that which you taught me as my duty;" when every right which had been secured by us from the

glorious past was scorned and scouted by an outrageous mob—I ask those gentlemen to tell me if they believe, with Enoch Louis Lowe in control of the destinies of this State, this civil war would have been averted?

The gentleman has told us that the cause of the war was a coterie of Governors of Northern States and so-called Union men in the Border States. The cause of the war? As to that let history speak. Why, sir, the cause of this war can be found as far back at least as the day when Thomas Jefferson said—I quote not the words exactly, but I give his idea—"I tremble when I remember that God is just; and if ever a conflict shall arise on the subject of this dark blot upon our national escutcheon, I fear we cannot count upon having the aid of the Almighty with us; because, having begun with the proud and general position that immortal souls were created alike by their Creator, we now deny to these slaves even the knowledge of the God who made them, I fear that Omnipotence will be against us." The cause of the war? Why, sir, we can go back for more than thirty years and find that the people of this country, or at least the portion where this civil war is now raging most fiercely, have been instructed by a man who was instigated by all that was fiendish, so far as the interests of this country were concerned, and gifted with all the subtlety that the father of lies could give him; who for thirty years wielded the minds of one portion of our country as a strong man would wield the actions of a child, who instructed them year after year that unless slavery could control the whole power of this Government, unless the extension of slavery was to be without limit, then this Government had better be destroyed, for he, like his disciples, would rather rule in hell than serve in heaven. They could not bear that the embrowned and hardened hand of labor should rule them. They could not bear that the voice of labor, speaking through the people of the North, should be as powerful as that which they desired to exert. They could not bear that their claim of right to the offices of the Government, that their almost hereditary right of legislation upon all that concerned their respective States should give way before the broad light of the intelligence of the North, and what have they done? Through the mouth of their present leader—Mr. Jefferson Davis—they have trumped up the cry that the North having sold their slaves South, and having got rid of their slave property at high prices when it had ceased to be valuable, is bound by the terms of the contract, and by the good faith of a vendor, to hold to the original compact, which they had refused to do.

But does the gentleman remember that a stronger man than Jefferson Davis, a man especially selected by the Secessionists so that if in the Providence of God it should so hap-