

Again, "It becomes us, therefore, to whom the whole question rightfully belongs to take immediate measures for its (slavery) removal, and which should be no longer delayed than may be required by a proper respect for those industrial pursuits with which the institution has been so long and so intimately interwoven, and a humane regard for the slave himself, which forbids us to cast him all unprepared for so great a change, too suddenly upon his feeble resources."

If we turn now to the Legislative departments of the State government we find that at the session of 1861 and 1862 the General Assembly of Maryland composed almost exclusively of *Union* men expressed views of the slavery question differing only in *phraseology* and not in substance from the executive teachings. Resolutions No. 8, introduced by Hon. William Price, declare in the preamble that "The General Assembly of Maryland have seen with concern certain indications at the seat of the General Government of an interference with the institution of slavery in the slave-holding States, and cannot hesitate to express their sentiments, and those of the people they represent in regard to a policy so *unwise* and *mischievous*."

Resolutions No. 15, offered in the House of Delegates by Mr. Donaldson, and amended by adding the seventh resolution on motion of Mr. Creswell, among other things announce—

"That the loyalty of the people of Maryland to the General Government, established by the Constitution, is untouched by any shade of servility, and they must ever regard with extreme jealousy all attempts, from whatever quarter, to make the present war for the restoration of the Union, the means of interfering with the domestic institutions of the States; and they solemnly protest against all schemes, the object or tendency of which is to incite insurrection among the slaves, declaring the same illegal, and calculated, if put in practice, to produce results too terrible to contemplate."

And resolution seventh, after indorsing "the course and policy of the President of the United States in the conduct of the war thus far" in the name of the people of Maryland, declares that "assured by his firmness and honesty in the past, they confidently expect that, in spite of the importunities of *pernicious fanatics*, he will keep steadily in view his sworn duty to preserve, pro-

tect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

These resolutions were passed by the Senate and House of Delegates with only one or two dissenting votes in each House, (see Journal of Senate p. 56, and Journal of House p. 85,) and received the support of Messrs. Goldsborough of Talbot, President of the Senate, Eichelberger, Berry, Speaker, Creswell, Price, Matthews and others, now prominent as the advocates of emancipation. Permit me to say, however, that I understand the President and the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Berry) to be in favor of emancipation, but that they are restrained by that conservative influence which would provide compensation, and place them somewhere on the common frontier referred to by Macauley.

And lastly, to bring down this recital of the *apparent* change which amid the *progressive* strides of the times seems sweeping over the State, I have only to ask you to contrast the issues upon which the Conservative Union Party battled in the campaign last autumn, avowing as a cardinal principle of its faith a "non-action policy" upon the subject of slavery, with the remarks of Hon. Thomas Swann, one of their leaders, made last winter in this Hall, who promised "to ride with whip and spur until every valley and every hill-top shall feel the tramp of his glorious mission, and the whole State of Maryland, from its centre to its circumference, shall be awakened to an edict of universal emancipation." If, Mr. President, you had seen his motions, you would have thought that he was then astride of his *Bucephalus*, fully booted and spurred for his ride.

I have not referred, Mr. President, in any *fault-finding* or *acrimonious* spirit to this record of the past. I desire no criminations or recriminations. But I do desire that every one should be made to occupy their *true* positions upon this question. I do not mean to be understood as denying the right of man in public stations to *change* an opinion. I am even willing to give them the benefit of the old adage—"wise men change their opinions *sometimes*, fools *never*." Let these gentlemen candidly avow the error of their past political course—let them admit that they have been made converts to a new faith, and that they now worship at a new political shrine—and I have no word to utter in denial of their right thus to erect new idols. In this there *may* be sincerity and manly honesty. But I do *object* to their