

were well calculated to create false impressions of our real condition. That condition was at all times sufficiently manifest to those who would take the trouble to seek for it through those sources from which the great channel of public sentiment is always supplied—the mighty masses of our industrial population. Traced by that deep current, Maryland sentiment has never varied, and there was never a time when her people, upon the same issues recently presented, would not have recorded their verdict in the same emphatic terms.

That this has been effected by any collateral circumstances, or, in the favorite phrase of Secessionists, is the result of “Maryland Subjugation,” is an insult to the intelligence and patriotism of her people which it scarcely becomes me to refute.

Any one who will recur to the history of this rebellion, the assumptions on which it is founded, and the objects it avows, and then in connection with them adverts to the character of our people, the geographical position of our State, and the effect of disunion upon her most important interests, the value and very existence of a material part of her property and her own security and peace, can come to no other conclusion than that for her people to declare unconditionally for the Union, is as much an instinct of self-preservation as of patriotic attachment to the principles of the Constitution.

It is not my purpose to detain you with a discussion of that fanciful theory invoked to the aid of those who have inaugurated the existing revolution, and which under the title of Secession claims the right of any State, at any time, and for any cause which she may declare sufficient, to cancel all her obligations to the Federal Constitution, and assume the exercise of powers which it emphatically prohibits. The notorious fact, that even among those who most openly avow their sympathy with Secession, there are but few anywhere to be found who do not indignantly repudiate its name, ought of itself to be sufficient to shew, that in Maryland, at least, no argument is necessary to overthrow this fallacy. She long since defined her position on this subject, with a clearness and a unanimity that should have assured all of what might be expected of her now. When South Carolina, thirty years ago, by her nullification ordinance, first formally put forth that pernicious dogma of State Supremacy, the Legislature of Maryland, as soon as it was brought to their attention, at their Session of 1832, adopted resolutions clearly showing that we repudiated it then, not less distinctly than we do today. These resolutions declare, “that the right to annul a law of the General Government, assumed by one State, is incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted