

them, save those who have studied military science, and, so far as their capacities enable them to do so, have mastered that science. Why, sir, one-half of the terrible butcheries of this unhappy civil war, have been the result of placing civilians, men not trained to arms, and having nothing but the ambition that led them to accept the positions, to the command of their fellow-citizens in the field. I think, if, in the time of invasion or insurrection, the governor of the State will faithfully discharge the merely civil duties pertaining to his office, he will have his hands full, and may well leave the direction of affairs in the field to some military man.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I shall offer the following amendment: strike out all after the word "laws," and insert, "and shall take command in person of the militia of the State when in active service of the State, or of the United States."

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. Say "may," not "shall;" give him the discretion.

Mr. VALLIANT. That is in conflict with the constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDENT. The amendment of the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Berry,) is not now in order. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott,) to strike out all after the word "laws."

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. I think it is entirely useless to make the governor the commander-in-chief of the forces of Maryland, without you give him the power to command them in the field. The gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands) has said a great deal about the results of placing those who are not military men, by education, as officers, over soldiers in the field. With that I have nothing to do. If you make your governor commander-in-chief of the forces of the State, as a matter of course, he ought to command them when in the field. If he knows that to be his duty when made governor, and he has no military instruction, then he ought to fit himself, not only for the civil, but the military responsibilities of his position. And no man should accept a position that he was not fitted for in any important point of view. And I will tell gentlemen, if they ever elect me governor of this State, and I have that power, I will lead them upon the field of battle myself.

Mr. PUGH. I wish to say in answer to the gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands,) that as long as you make the governor of the State, the commander-in-chief of the army and naval forces of the State, you do not get rid at all of this difficulty about political generals. That governor, and as commander-in-chief, if he sees fit, can appoint these political generals; and all the disasters pictured by the gentleman as resulting to our armies from that class of generals, will result still the same, from the appointment of those generals,

as they have resulted heretofore by similar appointments made by the President of the United States. The only way to remove that difficulty here, would be to strike out the whole section. If the governor is to be commander-in-chief, that settles the matter. He is commander-in-chief by virtue of the constitution, by virtue of his office as governor; and as commander-in-chief, all these evil results will follow from political generals under him, just as much as though he was a political general himself in the field.

But here is our security, viewing the constitution in this way; viewing the office of governor as I do; when we know that the man to be placed in the position of chief magistrate of the State is to have this wonderful power, when we know, as the gentleman from Howard says, that he has the lives of our brethren in his hands, we will be more guarded in our action in electing a governor; we will not elect a man for that high position who is not qualified in every way to be the guardian of our lives and interests.

Mr. SANDS. Does not the argument of the gentleman result in this: that we are not to elect a man for governor who has not a military education?

Mr. PUGH. No, sir. It will have just the effect I have stated; it will make us more guarded in our selection of that officer. I do not pretend to announce the doctrine that we should always elect a West Point graduate to be governor of this State. But we should elect a careful man, a man who feels the responsibility of his position as commander-in-chief of our army as well as in every other respect; a man who would not sacrifice the lives of the citizens committed to his care by appointing political generals over them; a man who would not himself take command in the field if he saw and felt himself unfit to command. A governor of the State who will commit the lives of our soldiers to the care of an incompetent general, would also, if he had the power, inflict just as great an injury in some other manner upon the citizens of the State. He is not fit to be the representative of the people of the State, unless he guards their interests in this respect as well as in all others. If he is the governor of the State, and by virtue of that office the commander-in-chief of the army, he has the power by virtue alone of that position—if he is unprincipled, as the gentleman suggests might be possible—to do all the injury that the gentleman has depicted.

Mr. SANDS. The gentleman mistakes my argument. I did not say that the governor would be unprincipled. I said he might be incompetent as a military man.

Mr. PUGH. I did not represent the gentleman as saying that the governor would be unprincipled. I say that a man is unprincipled who has been selected by the people of this State to command the military forces of